


THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2022 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE

BEING THE REPORT OF THE CHURCH
CONGRESS AT CHELTENHAM, 1928

Edited by

THE REV. CANON H. A. WILSON,

HON. CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE SEMINARY
LIBRARY.

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

283.09
C561a

First Edition . . . 1929

34898

PREFACE

I HAVE been requested to write a few words by way of preface to the Report of the Church Congress, which was held at Cheltenham in October of this year, and I do so gladly as it will give me an opportunity to explain the purpose that those who were responsible for the Congress had in view in the selection of the subjects and of the speakers who were to discuss them.

It seemed to us that at the present time we should boldly attack the most fundamental questions which are facing the Christian Church, the relation of Church and State, the history, the authority, the mission of the Church of England, the Christian Faith and Modern Thought, and the problem of Reunion.

In order to discuss these questions in a way which would be profitable, it was obvious that we must ask representatives of all the different phases of thought in the Church to express their opinions. It is only in an atmosphere of freedom that profitable discussion can take place. Some criticism was made on the fact that we had selected amongst others prominent representatives of what is called "The Modernist Party." As they represent a large body of the clergy and laity who are in the Church of England and claim to be loyal members of it, it would have been

quite inconsistent with our purpose not to ask them because their opinions were unpalatable to some people. I may add that I received letters privately complaining that Anglo-Catholics had been invited to address the Congress. The Congress must represent the Church of England as a whole, and it is not for me or for the Committee to determine the limits of that Church.

I venture to think that the result has justified our action. I believe that we had the good fortune to secure a very able body of speakers representing very different points of view, and the result has been a series of papers which will form a permanent contribution to the religious thought of the day. I think also that a further result will be apparent. I do not believe if the majority of these addresses were published anonymously that it would be possible for the careful reader to be at all certain about the theological opinions of the writers. They are in no case conventional in their language. The writers invariably attempt to arrive at the truth on the problems that they were discussing, but I think that they show a very great amount of common belief and adequately represent the teaching of the Church.

On the final subject, that of Christian Reunion, we again decided to make a new departure. It was felt that the time had come when a discussion on these problems, only from our own point of view, was of little practical value. What we must learn was how things look to other Churches and Christian Societies, and so we invited the leading representatives of different Christian Churches to address the Congress. Again I feel that those who read this

report will recognize that our decision was a right one, and that the papers will make a permanent and valuable contribution to the question of Reunion.

I would, in conclusion, like to express once more my gratitude to the many distinguished writers who were willing to help us and who contributed to the value of the work done by the Congress. Those who were present felt strengthened and inspired by its proceedings, and I hope that many of them will desire to be able to read quietly what they were only able to listen to at the meeting, and I hope that many of those who were not present will find our contributions to the questions of the day of some value.

A. C. GLOUCESTER:

St. Luke's Day, 1928.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS. THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF GLOUCESTER . . .	3

THE NATIONAL CHURCH

(1) THE NATIONAL CHURCH AND THE PAPACY. THE REV. J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., <i>Dixie Professor of Ecclesiastical History, Cambridge</i> . . .	39
(2) THE REFORMATION AND THE NATIONAL CHURCH. THE REV. CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A., <i>Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London</i>	51
(3) THE GROWTH OF NONCONFORMITY. THE REV. CANON E. W. WATSON, D.D., <i>Regius Pro- fessor of Ecclesiastical History, Oxford</i> . . .	59
(4) THE CHURCH AS THE SPIRITUAL ORGAN OF THE NATION.	
THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM .	69
THE RT. HON. LORD HUGH CECIL, P.C., M.P. .	79
MAJOR J. D. BIRCHALL, M.P.	84

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

(1) THE CATHOLIC TRADITION. THE REV. CANON T. A. LACEY, D.D., <i>Canon of Worcester</i> .	93
(2) THE APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE AND THE PURITAN MOVEMENT. THE REV. CANON J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., <i>Canon of St. Paul's</i> .	99
(3) ERASMUS AND THE APPEAL TO SOUND LEARNING. THE REV. L. ELLIOTT BINNS, D.D., <i>Vicar of Gedney, Lincolnshire</i> . . .	113

- (4) THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF
 ANGLICAN THEOLOGY. THE REV. CANON
 H. MAYNARD SMITH, D.D., *Canon of Gloucester* 124

MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

- (1) ENGLISH MYSTICISM. R. ELLIS ROBERTS,
 B.A. 139
- (2) THE BROAD CHURCH AND MODERNIST
 MOVEMENT. THE REV. CANON B. H.
 STREETER, D.D., F.B.A., *Canon of Hereford* . 148
- (3) THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT. THE REV.
 C. M. CHAVASSE, M.A., M.C., *Rector of St. Peter-
 le-Bailey, Oxford* 157
- (4) THE OXFORD MOVEMENT. THE REV. CANON
 E. G. SELWYN, D.D., *Rector of Redhill, Havant* 170
- (5) THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL MOVEMENT. THE
 RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF WOOLWICH . 182

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

- THE REV. CANON O. C. QUICK, *Canon of Carlisle* . 195
- THE REV. CANON H. A. WILSON, *Rector of Chelten-
 ham* 206
- THE REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A., *Principal
 of Ripon Hall, Oxford* 215
- THE REV. CANON H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., *Regius Pro-
 fessor of Divinity, Oxford* 224
- THE REV. CANON A. NAIRNE, D.D., *Regius Professor
 of Divinity, Cambridge* 239

THE FAITH AND MODERN THOUGHT

- (1) EVOLUTION AND THE IDEA OF GOD. THE
 VERY REV. W. R. INGE, D.D., C.V.O., F.B.A.,
Dean of St. Paul's 251
- (2) THE PLACE OF THE INCARNATION IN
 MODERN THOUGHT. THE REV. R. J.
 CAMPBELL, D.D., *Vicar of Holy Trinity, Brighton* 261

	PAGE
(3) THE FALL AND THE ATONEMENT IN THE LIGHT OF SCIENTIFIC TEACHING. THE REV. CANON N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D., <i>Lady Mar-</i> <i>garet Professor, Oxford</i>	270
(4) THE UNIFORMITY OF NATURE AND THE FREEDOM OF MAN. THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM	283
(5) CRITICISM AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE. THE REV. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., <i>Student of Christ Church, Oxford</i>	298
(6) MIRACLES. THE REV. J. KENNETH MOZLEY, D.D., <i>Warden of St. Augustine's House, Reading</i>	309
(7) THE CHRISTIAN FAITH AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY. THE REV. W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., <i>Professor of the Philosophy of Religion,</i> <i>King's College, London</i>	321
(8) THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF PER- SONALITY. THE REV. L. W. GRENSTED, B.D., <i>Fellow of University College, Oxford</i> . .	330

RELATIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNIONS AND REUNION IN THE MISSION FIELD

THE MOST REVEREND ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS, <i>Metro-</i> <i>politan of Thyateira</i>	345
THE RIGHT REVEREND V. AMMUNDSEN, <i>Bishop of</i> <i>Haderslev, Denmark</i>	367
PROFESSOR ADOLF DEISSMANN, D.D., <i>Germany</i> .	384
THE LORD SANDS	402
THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., <i>Principal of Hackney</i> <i>and New College, London</i>	413
THE REV. W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D., <i>Principal and</i> <i>Professor of Handsworth Wesleyan College,</i> <i>Birmingham</i>	422
THE REV. G. E. PHILLIPS, <i>London Missionary Society</i>	435
THE REV. CANON GARFIELD H. WILLIAMS, <i>Secretary,</i> <i>Missionary Council of the Church Assembly</i> .	449

CONGRESS SERMONS

	PAGE
(1) ST. MATTHEW'S, CHELTENHAM. THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM	463
(2) ALL SAINTS, CHELTENHAM. THE RT. REV. CHARLES GORE, D.D.	474
(3) CHRIST CHURCH, CHELTENHAM. THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD	487
(4) GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL. THE MOST REV. THE LORD ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN	499

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESS

BY THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF
GLOUCESTER

IN welcoming the Congress to the Diocese of Gloucester, to the county of Gloucester and to the town of Cheltenham, I welcome you to a district of England famous for its natural beauties—the hills and villages of the Cotswolds, the Forest of Dean, and the great valley of the Severn; famous, too, for its ancient churches, Gloucester, Tewkesbury, Cirencester, Northleach, Fairford, Campden, Winchcombe, and many more; to a garden town not without distinction in the ecclesiastical annals of the country; to a Diocese conspicuous for the large number of laymen and lay-women who, coming from every station of life, are loyal and convinced members of the Church of England and are ready to devote to its cause their means, their ability and their service.

And it is to the Church of England and its development into the Anglican Communion that we are to devote our attention during the week, and to the most fundamental problems which concern the well-being of the Church of Christ. It was felt by those who constructed the programme of the Congress that the state of opinion in the country at the present day demanded that we should boldly face the deepest

questions which are exercising the minds of thoughtful people, the spiritual authority of our Church and the truth of our religion. And in relation to these there are certain great questions that I would discuss with you to-day. These are—

- (1) The relations of Church and State ;
- (2) The corporate authority of the Church and religious parties ;
- (3) The faith of Christ and modern thought ;
- (4) The relation of the Church of England to other Communions and the problem of Christian reunion.

I

But first let us attempt to describe the Church of England as it has developed into the Anglican Communion.

The Church of England claims to be an integral part of that Society founded by our Lord Jesus Christ which we call the Church of Christ or the Catholic Church. Christianity was first taught in these islands not later than the second century ; the Church of the English people was first established some 1,200 years ago. During the long period that has intervened since then it has had a chequered history, but it has continuously taught the Gospel of Christ to the people of this land. In the course of its history it has exhibited and developed certain distinctive characteristics. Although unfortunately not at present in communion with the ancient churches of the East and West, it has preserved all the fundamental principles of historical Christianity, while it has been inspired by the warmth of the Evangelical message, in ancient and modern times alike. It has

from its earliest days been a learned Church and has claimed to present Christianity as a solution of the problems that perplex the human intellect. At the time of the Reformation, on grounds both national and ecclesiastical, it rejected the claims of the Papacy to the exercise of supremacy and jurisdiction over other churches, and on that point it agrees with those communions which are called Protestant. The Church of England is fundamentally Catholic; it is incidentally Protestant, for that characteristic of Protestantism would cease if the Papacy gave up, or was deprived of, its unjust claims. Partly owing to the character and history of the Reformation, partly owing to its connection with the State, partly to certain features of its organization, partly, I think, to certain national characteristics of the English people, the Church of England has avoided the misfortune of being built up on the teaching of any individual theologian. It does not represent a partial or one-sided aspect of the Christian religion. It preserves the traditions of a many-sided life which befit an historical society. It is, in the best sense of the word, comprehensive.

Owing to the colonizing energy of the people of this country, the growth of the British Empire and its widespread commerce, owing also to the missionary enterprise of the English Church, this representation of the Christian religion has spread beyond the limits of this country, and under the name of Anglicanism presents itself as one of the varied forms in which Christianity appears in the world, side by side with Romanism, Orthodoxy, Lutheranism, Calvinism, and so on; and it has itself produced other types of Christianity, such as Wesleyanism, which have un-

fortunately, and we may hope temporally, been separated from it.

We shall in the course of our meetings have the leading features in the development of the Church of England and the various aspects of its religious life presented by those most capable of the task, and I may pass on to the consideration of the problems that I have selected for our consideration to-day.

II

The rejection of the Prayer Book has put before us in an acute form the problem of the relation of Church and State. The Christian Church is a society founded by our Lord Jesus Christ. It deals with the spiritual well-being of mankind, and is not in any way concerned with material things. Within the sphere of the spiritual it should be independent and its authority supreme; its influence and authority must be supported by purely spiritual means; if it appeal to force and attempt to establish itself on worldly power it will fail in its mission. The State is the nation organized for the protection of life and property, whether against enemies abroad or evil-doers at home. It is concerned with the material well-being of the country. Although it should be able to arouse the loyalty of the people, its authority is based on force and power. It has large revenues, arising from forced contributions, and because it has power and wealth, and because the people in their corporate capacity can accomplish much, it tends more and more to extend the scope of its activities; and as the spiritual condition of the nation has much influence on its material prosperity,

and as a religious majority seeks the support of the State to extend its influence it has a constant tendency to encroach on the sphere of religion. A union between Church and State for the well-being of the people has been common in history and, if established on sound lines, beneficial. But if the State has encroached on the sphere of the Church, or the Church on that of the State, the result has been disastrous.

There are two reasons which make the rejection of the Prayer Book injurious to the Church. The one is that it injures its spiritual independence. It means the encroachment of the State on the domain of the Church. It is, and has always been recognized to be, the function of the Church to formulate its faith and regulate its worship; nor has that position ever been departed from. Each successive revision of the Prayer Book of the Church of England has been the work of the Church, and the need for its acceptance by the State only lay in the unfortunate fact that it was considered necessary to fortify the authority of the Church by that of the State and to regulate worship by an Act of Uniformity. It was only the desire for a State-enforced uniformity that made the authority of Parliament necessary, and I would suggest that the repeal of that Act would do all that is necessary at the present moment to restore the spiritual independence of the Church of England. There are still those in the House of Commons who think that Divine Service should be regulated by the law of the land; but it is just this reliance on law which has been the cause of the difficulties of the Church of England. The habit of irregularity has grown up as the direct result of administering the worship of the Church by

enforcing laws, the authority for which is not recognized by a large body of Church-people.

But the second, and even more fundamental, argument against the authority of Parliament in spiritual matters is that so long as it is allowed to continue, any reunion at home is impossible. It is curious that the opponents of the Prayer Book, who are just those who claim to be most eager for reunion with Nonconformity in this country, do not recognize this. It is an interesting illustration of the theological ignorance of the House of Commons. The belief in the spiritual autonomy of the Church is not a fad of the High Churchman, as it appears that some imagine, but is one of the most fundamental beliefs of the Presbyterian, of the Congregationalist, of the Baptist, of all who call themselves specifically Free Churchmen. It is the belief held by them almost fanatically, and unless some remedy is found for the present situation, Reunion and the creation of a united National Church is impossible.

That must mean either Disestablishment or a solution on lines similar to the Church of Scotland Act of 1921.

I am not ashamed to confess that I should regret, seriously regret, Disestablishment. I believe that the partnership which it implies, of Church and State, is for the benefit of both. I am prepared to make considerable sacrifices for the preservation of that union. I believe that this national assertion of religious belief gives dignity to the nation, helps in the presentation of religion to the people, and is beneficial even to those who do not belong to the National Church. I believe that any further alien-

ation of the inherited property of the Church from religious uses will be a grave misfortune. I believe that the action of the State in dealing with Church property at and since the Reformation, and much of what has been called reform, has been harmful to our national and spiritual well-being. I do not think that the moral and spiritual condition of the United States or the British colonies suggests that there is any great advantage in the absence of a National Church. The very fact that it is difficult to say in what the Establishment consists seems to me a proof that a spiritual fact which interferes so little with the life of an ordinary citizen, need not be destroyed. If there were in this country a United National Church few would desire that the national recognition of religion should come to an end, and I do not think the State would contemplate with equanimity the existence of so powerful a corporation in complete independence.

I do not desire Disestablishment, I do not believe that it would benefit anyone, but it might be necessary to accept it, even to work for it.

The other solution is that offered by the Church of Scotland Act of 1921, which gives to that Church full spiritual independence. I know of no reason why the same measure of freedom should not be gained by the Church of England. Our new Constitution, the Church Assembly and its subordinate bodies are more democratic than the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland, for there the elders in each parish hold a life office and are therefore only, in a limited degree, representative. But if the reasons against such a spiritual freedom are slight, there is at the

present time much prejudice. It must be remembered that our constitution is a recent creation. It has not yet become part of the thought of many Church-people ; by some it is resented, and looked on with suspicion. It must be remembered, too, that there is a strong Erastian tradition in the Church, and that by many people their affection for the National Church is expressed in terms of Erastianism. I do not think, therefore, that any very satisfactory solution of our present problems will be found in the immediate future.

What, then, should be our policy ? It should be one of patience. Let us remember that the Church of Scotland, which in this matter is ahead of us, had to wait for seventy-eight years to attain its freedom, and to pass through great and serious crises. We want a patient statemanship, not merely in our leaders, but in the whole Church ; for it is the unconscious statesmanship of the whole body of the people, whether it be the nation or the Church, which is really the great force in politics. Statesmanship does not mean a spirit of compromise which meets every crisis with a temporary expedient, which fears and postpones a decision. Such a policy will always end in disaster. It means rather that we have a clear policy in our minds, that we work for that policy with patience and foresight, that at each crisis and at each opportunity we try to make a decision which will take us a step forward, however slight it may be.

Our aim is that the Church of England should be in a real sense the Church of the nation ; that it should be a free, united, self-governing community, working in harmony with the State as the corporate expression

of the nation's spiritual life, not attempting to intrude by direct action on the field of politics, or social reform, or international relations, but supreme in its own spiritual sphere, educating the people in the principles of Christianity, and so making them, individually and collectively, more and more fitted to administer the affairs of a free country.

III

I pass to my second problem, the corporate authority of the Church and religious parties. It was not, in my opinion, the rejection of the Prayer Book by the House of Commons that was the most serious fact in the situation. That can be explained and excused by the prevalence of an imperfect tradition. It was the appeal to Parliament against the expressed corporate voice of the Church which was made by two considerable parties in the Church. The Church had in the most constitutional manner adopted a new Prayer Book. It was passed by large majorities in the Assembly and in Convocation, and by Diocesan and Ruridecanal conferences. But two sections of the Church refused to accept this verdict, the one wishing to deny their fellow-churchmen the legalized use of customs which have prevailed in the Church and will continue to prevail—the other demanding that there should be no check or restraint on their actions by any corporate decision of the Church. I notice that in a recent article Sir Thomas Inskip tells us that the new Prayer Book represents a compromise, while both parties who opposed it were influenced by principles. I do not think that a better instance than that could be given of the perversion

and exaggeration of party spirit which is the real cause of our difficulties within the Church, and of the conditions which have produced Christian disunion. The particular tenets of parties are exalted into principles, the Catholic voice of the Church is called compromise. For in every fundamental point where the new Prayer Book has to mediate between parties it represents the Catholic voice of the Church; the new Canon, Reservation without Adoration, Prayers for the Departed—all represent traditional, historical, Catholic usages, and Romanism and Protestantism on either side represent imperfect, partial, incomplete, uncatholic opinions.

What is this party spirit? How does it arise? It represents the exaggeration of one particular aspect of the Christian tradition. In studying the movement of thought in the English Church, as you are asked to do, under the guidance of able theologians and historians, you will have described to you the Catholic tradition and the Oxford Movement, the principles of the Reformation, the appeal to Scripture and the Evangelical Movement, the appeal to learning, the Broad Church and Modernist Movement, other movements also which have played their part in the history of our Church. All of these represent aspects of the truth. They have emphasized beliefs necessary for the times. They have helped in the building up of our common religious heritage. But they are all imperfect, partial, incomplete representations of the truth, and when men's minds are concentrated on these things to the exclusion of more fundamental truths, and to the neglect of other aspects of the truth, then we begin to get the substitution of party spirit

for the catholic universal aspect of the Gospel. That is what has happened among us. That is the evil which the new Prayer Book was intended to cure, but which has succeeded in defeating it. I may add, through the unstatesmanlike action of the House of Commons.

The problem before us is, How are we to strengthen the corporate life of the Church and to make it stronger than the party tendency? We are not asked to do away with parties, for that is an impossibility. There are few people who can grasp with a due sense of proportion the whole of the Christian revelation in all its aspects. It is inevitable that each person must lay stress on those aspects of the truth that appeal to him most—its emotional, its intellectual, its historical, its institutional, its ceremonial, or its social aspect. It is inevitable that people will classify and arrange themselves according to their interests. A church which has only one point of view is not a church, but a sect. We want a rich variety of religious life. At all times when the Church has been strong and religion vigorous there have been many varied presentations of the Christian message—in the undivided Church of the early centuries, as in the great period of the mediæval Church. It is rightly one of the boasts of the Church of England that it is comprehensive, that there is room in it for those to whom Christianity appeals from different standpoints. We do not want to be without Anglo-Catholics, or Evangelicals, or Modernists, or Christian Socialists, but we want them all alike to realize their loyalty and allegiance to the Church to which they belong.

How are we to attain this? We want first of all

to emphasize the corporate organization of the Church, whether for administration or for conference. Recent years have seen great progress in this direction. The creation of the Church Assembly and the granting to it of legislative power has done much to concentrate attention on the Church in its corporate capacity. The success so far has been mainly on the lines of administration and finance. It is a matter of the greatest importance that now it is primarily to the Diocesan Board of Finance that a clergyman must appeal for financial assistance, for curates' grants, for the increase of his stipend, for Schools, for Church building, for almost any purpose. There are still societies, some of them of a party complexion, and it is wise in a Church which has so great a task before it that we should not aim at too centralized a control, whether in the Church as a whole or in the Diocese, but the Diocesan and central organizations should be made really strong and interest should be concentrated on the general work of the Church. So also the Church as a whole should summon its members to take part in conference and receive instruction, whether in the Rural Deanery, or the Diocese, or in a wider area. Party Conferences, whether Anglo-Catholic—with regard to this word, let me say that I use it under protest in this sense ; “Anglo-Catholic” is by tradition the characteristic of the whole English Church and not of a party in it—or Evangelical, or Modernist, in which there is no opposition are fruitful nurseries of error.

A second step in advance may come directly out of the situation created by the New Prayer Book through the regulation of the worship of the Church

by the Bishops acting in harmony with their clergy through the Diocesan Synod. For the last hundred years our Directories of worship have been the work of private enterprise. If a clergyman wanted advice as to how he might best improve the services of his church, the last person to whom he would think of applying would be his Bishop. It has come to be assumed that the purpose of a Bishop is to prevent a clergyman from doing things and to restrain excessive zeal and enthusiasm. The clergyman who wanted to make his services appeal more effectively to his people obtained his inspiration from some quite different source, often a very unwise one. In the future it will have to be different. It must be recognized that it is the duty of the Bishop not merely to prevent his clergy from doing things which they ought not, but to encourage them in doing what they ought. It is to the Bishop, and not to the House of Commons, or the English Church Union, or the Church Association, that the regulation of the services of the Church belongs, and that duty should be exercised in a constitutional manner through the Diocesan Synods. Only let the Bishops remember that their duty should be a positive one—to help their clergy do what is right.

Just as the Church has failed in its corporate capacity to direct or regulate its worship, so it has failed in its teaching capacity. A large proportion of the laity have never been given either an intelligent account of the Christian religion or of the teaching of the Church of England. They do not know where they are in religious matters. This requires a somewhat more careful analysis. In order that people

may be properly taught, there must be some authority to state what they should be taught, and there must be a great body of teachers competent to give instruction. In both directions we fail at the present time.

What is the teaching of the Church of England ? It is contained in the Prayer Book, the Thirty-nine Articles, and in the Church Catechism. Now, however admirable these may be, it cannot be said that they are always explicit or clear or easily understood, nor do they present the teaching of the Church in a way which appeals to modern thought. From time to time dogmatic utterances have been made by the Bishops, generally in answer to some popular demand and condemning Modernist tenets. But it is not dogmatic utterances such as these that are required ; it is wise teaching. The interpretation, therefore, of Church teaching has very largely been left to manuals of a partisan character, and many professing Christians in this country have been trained, not on the teaching of the Church of England, but on an interpretation of it in some particular direction—not indeed untrue, but one-sided. Nowadays anyone who goes into a church which is at all a centre of life will find a selection of tracts set forth for the congregation to read or purchase, and he will probably find that most of them are written from a party point of view, and some of them are of an extremely party character.

I would mention another and somewhat different direction in which this failure to teach has operated. It is on a subject on which I shall be speaking to you very shortly—the relation of Christian truth to modern thought. On this subject our English theo-

logians have produced most valuable work. I will not say that they have solved the problems presented to them, for many of them can never be finally solved ; but they have given us a wise and sober presentation of the Christian faith which has nothing in it which conflicts with the assured results of science and criticism. Now this has never been properly taught to the great body of our people. From time to time there emerge crude and violent controversies on these subjects in our newspapers, which show that for many people there is no alternative between fundamentalism and disbelief. A striking illustration was the Bishop of Birmingham's sermon on the doctrine of the Fall. There was little in that sermon which had not been a commonplace of theological instruction in the Universities and in many theological colleges for the last forty years. Yet this sermon was greeted by the Press and by many scientific men as something startling and novel. Some welcomed it. To others it seemed dangerous. To all apparently it was new. I believe that the cause was the failure of the great body of our clergy to teach properly.

The importance of assiduous teaching in influencing public opinion is great. The position of the Labour Party in this country at the present time has been brought about by the unremitting teaching of their political philosophy during the last twenty years. It is always the characteristic of the adherents of new doctrines that they devote themselves with eagerness and enthusiasm to propaganda. It is characteristic of a new party in the Church that they will be eager to propagate their views. The failure lies in the great body of the clergy, and in the indifference of a

large part of the laity to religious truth. The Church has not seriously approached the problem of teaching the people under the conditions of the present day. The opportunities which Confirmation might give are largely neglected. In some parishes, indeed, serious instruction is given ; but I have often been astonished at the meagre amount of preparation which many consider sufficient. Nor do I think there is an adequate use made of the pulpit by many of the clergy for teaching. There is a certain deadness which arises from a want of enthusiasm which produces a feeling of unreality.

More serious even than the corporate failure to teach is the neglect of the Church to do its duty in the training of candidates for Orders.

In 1918 there was issued a Report on the " Teaching Office of the Church." It is characteristic of our failure to consider important things first, that a large part of this Report has been allowed to remain a dead letter. Especially is that the case as regards the portion of it devoted to the training of candidates for Orders, and the development of Church teaching in the new Universities. I will dwell here only on one point. It tells us " that the training of the ministry should be the concern of the Church in its corporate capacity, and should be made one of the first and most essential charges on its revenues." To this were added important recommendations emphasizing the importance of the Church carrying on this work in close connection with the Universities. Some of these were repeated by the Commission on the Property and Finance of the Church, which recommended that the corporate revenues of the Church should be

used for this purpose. These recommendations have all remained a dead letter. Many of the less important things have been attended to, but those that concern its fundamental message have been ignored.

Now I believe that the chief cause of the exaggeration of sectional and party interest in the Church is the fact that so many of the clergy are trained in institutions which deliberately and purposely lay themselves out to turn out good Anglo-Catholics, or good Evangelicals, or good Modernists, rather than good members of the Church of England. At Oxford, for example, there are now three theological colleges, each of a definite theological complexion, besides Pusey House and the Evangelical Pastorate—all designed to produce good party men—while the work of the Church of England and the sober teaching of Christianity is neglected. Not only does this cause the inevitable growth of party spirit, but it is alienating the great body of the younger generation, who have no use for a religion which seems to dwell continuously on the small things of party controversy and to care little or nothing for the big things of the Christian faith.

This, I think, touches on one point that I would emphasize. A hundred years ago the revenues of the Church of England were unreformed and certain Bishops and ecclesiastical corporations had large, even excessive, sums at their disposal. There seems to have been considerable effort made to promote the corporate work of the Church: King's College in London and Durham University were founded. Since then these revenues have been administered by the Ecclesiastical Commissioner, and until quite

recently hardly anything has been done with them to advance the corporate life of the Church, or which touches its work as an intelligent body. The revenues have been employed almost entirely on improving the incomes of the parochial clergy. Now that is an admirable thing to do, but I would venture to put to you that it would really have been done more effectively if some of this revenue had been used directly for making the Church more efficient. For if all the clergy of the Church of England were doing their work efficiently, there would be few clergy who would be inadequately paid.

I will only ask you to consider this. The revenues of the See of Durham, if they were all in the hands of the Bishop, would be some £300,000 a year. If this income had been administered by Lightfoot, and Westcott, and, I would add, the present Bishop of Durham, I think the position of the Church in the North of England would have been very different to what it is. We should have had a great and efficient University for the training of the clergy which would have strengthened the intellectual and spiritual influence of the Church, and the populous industrial districts of the North would have abounded in beautiful modern churches instead of the uninspiring buildings which modern business-like methods provide.

And then lastly. We are only too ready to think about the less important things of religion to the exclusion of the greater things. Seventy years ago Frederick Denison Maurice lashed the Evangelicals of his time because they substituted a scheme of salvation for the Gospel. At the present day, many of those who talk most about the Catholic Faith seem

to think that it is concerned with teaching concerning things which are uncertain, unimportant, and in reality uncatholic. But whether we call it the Gospel or whether we call it the Catholic Faith, what it is really concerned with are certain great truths, and it is on these that the Church should dwell if it wishes its message to be heard. They are the fundamental teaching concerning God and Jesus Christ; the revelation of God as righteousness and love and sacrifice; the salvation of man in Christ; a message telling us of the life and destiny of man. It is the presentation to us of reality. This is what people wish to hear now. It is this that we should put in the forefront of our teaching. We are often asked what it is that the young men and young women of the present day want. What they do not want are the little things of party controversy. They want a gospel for life, and only too often they are not given it. If we could learn to concentrate our teaching on the great things of the Christian religion and place subordinate matters in their proper place, we should increase both the effectiveness of our message and the unity of the Church.

IV

And this leads me naturally to the third main subject that I desire to discuss with you: the relation of the gospel of Christ to the thought of the day. Do not let us make any mistake. The religious difficulty of the day is not all the transient questions which we are so eager to discuss and quarrel over. What is exercising thoughtful men's minds is the fundamental question—Is Christianity true? Some disbelieve,

either fiercely as enemies or sadly as those who have lost something that they valued much, something which added to the beauty and happiness of life. Some doubt, and many, I think—and that applies especially to the younger generation—are expectant. They are ready to accept a gospel if it is preached to them in an intelligent way, so that they can feel that it is true.

The most anti-Christian body of men are the second-rate literary men. They look upon its creed as a mythology. They hate its morality, for it would put a restraint on their evil desires. There is nothing particularly novel about these men. There has always been the clever literary man who looks upon the true and the noble and the good things of the world as the fitting object of a jest or a sneer. We need not waste time on them. The great artist, it has been said, aims at seeing the world as God sees it. These men would see it as the devil does.

Let us pass to more serious things. An able man of science once said to me, "I do not think that there is anything in science which conflicts with the truths of religion, but all the same it is very difficult for a scientific man to believe." It is often equally difficult for the religious man to comprehend or believe the teaching of science. In either case, the mind which is concentrated on one aspect of the world finds it difficult to see things from another point of view. But these intellectual difficulties are not arguments, and I think that it is becoming more widely recognized that the teaching of science does not and cannot conflict with religious truth. For it can deal only with phenomena. It cannot deal with the ultimate

cause of things. When you have completely studied the mechanism of an elaborate motor-car you have not explained how it came into being nor why it is that it is directed along a certain course. The more perfect it is, the more accurately does it fulfil the purpose of its designer and carry out the wishes of the driver ; but, however perfect it may be and however much we may study it, we find no means of learning the mind behind it. So it is with the Universe. We know more than we did what it is like. The intricacy of its construction becomes to us each year more wonderful. But no more than it did in its early beginnings can science teach us of its origin or its purpose or of the force that controls it.

From time to time some great new generalization is put forward, such as Evolution, and it seems to explain everything ; but soon the novelty wears off and we find that it is just a more satisfactory explanation than we had before of the way in which things have happened, but that it does not tell us anything about the cause, or the purpose, or the controlling influence. The limitations of science are becoming increasingly recognized, and I see no reason why the thoughtful Christian should not see in the development of the world as it is revealed by science the signs of the same Divine purpose that he sees in human history—the purpose of God from the foundation of the world leading up to the revelation of God in Christ, the great fact of history, the Incarnation.

And if I turn to the teaching of the physicists and their speculations about Relativity and the structure of the atom, my mind may be bewildered by the

difference between the world as they describe it and the world as I see it, but I am sure that no materialistic theory of their Universe is adequate to explain it to the human mind and to account for the wonder that they describe. If my religious experience or philosophical thought, or revelation itself, gives me what I consider good grounds for believing in God, I am sure that the discoveries of modern science, so far from conflicting with this belief, might welcome it as the only hypothesis adequate to account for the wonders that have been revealed to us.

I turn to philosophy. You will have the results of its teaching put before you with far greater ability than I possess. I will only suggest to you the impression of the tendencies of modern thought as they have appeared to me. I do not think that systems of philosophy which attempt to explain the world on a material basis obtain wide assent. I do not think that people feel that they can attain truth by a careful analysis of mathematical conceptions. The logical constructions which build up the philosophy of the Absolute are too narrow in their premises. More attractive to some are the various Pantheistic theories which seem to supply a basis for modern scientific ideas. A Creative Evolution appears to afford a spiritual explanation of the Universe, but it is really only materialism under another name. At first sight it seems to give the advantages of Theism and avoid the difficulties of belief in a personal God ; for admittedly it is difficult to conceive the idea of a supreme personality ; but a God who is impersonal is in no real sense at all a God, and if the difficulties of personality are avoided, the difficulties of a First

Principle which is not personal are greater to those who allow the existence of spiritual realities ; for righteousness and love and truth and beauty have no real meaning except in relation to a person. So it seems to me that we may with some confidence follow those philosophers who have taught us of "Moral Values and the Idea of God ", who have boldly defended the belief in a personal God and in personal immortality.

But the grounds of our belief are not primarily either logic or philosophy. Our belief is based upon the revelation of God in Jesus Christ, and the ultimate question that we have to ask is whether the conclusions of modern criticism have undermined the authority of Christian revelation. I think that the first point that I should like to suggest to you is the extreme uncertainty of criticism. It is the custom of the advocates of each modern theory as it arises to adopt an attitude of intellectual superiority and to look with some contempt on the old-fashioned people who are slow to adopt their new teaching. I do not think that they have any greater justification for that attitude than have their opponents. On almost all critical questions the conclusions, whether of Modernists or of Orthodox, are precarious. Anyone acquainted with the history of Biblical studies during the last seventy years will know how many conclusions which were put forward before us authoritatively in the past have been allowed to sink gradually into oblivion—for example, the whole Tübingen theory. I do not think the arguments in support of its successors are any more convincing. But equally is it impossible to hold the old theories

of the inspiration and structure of the Scriptures. Orthodox and Modernist alike should learn modesty.

Our belief in the reality of the Christian revelation does not ultimately depend upon the critical arguments, but it would be untenable if certain forms of criticism were correct. The question, then, is, Are the assured and probable results of criticism such as to compel us to believe that the Christian faith is really a mythology? I do not believe so. I notice in the first place, that to a very considerable extent it is not the criticism that has compelled the acceptance of the conclusions, but the conclusions that have inspired the criticism. People disbelieve in the Resurrection, not because the evidence for it is bad, but because they think it cannot have happened. So they alter or explain away the evidence. I notice again how much the older critical theories have been overthrown by a wiser criticism. For example, how changed is the critical attitude to the Synoptic Gospels and their historical value, compared with what it used to be. All modern investigation tends to show that they are good history.

But the chief thing that we have to remember is that what requires explanation is the existence of Christianity, the revelation and power of the Gospels, and that quite definitely the theories of these writers, whose attitude is purely naturalistic, are not adequate to explain this. A good many critics may have accounted for Christianity to their own satisfaction, but their solutions enjoy only a temporary acceptance. Their followers are often as scornful of the older critics as they are of the orthodox. The Gospel narrative

and the reality of the Faith will explain Christianity, and nothing else will.

During the coming week you will receive much and adequate help for the discussion of these and similar questions. You will have an ample opportunity of forming your own judgment, but I would like to express to you my opinion that however much it may be necessary for us to reconsider and restate our attitude on many subordinate points, I do not feel that any of the conclusions of science or criticism which have won permanent acceptance are such as to prevent you from accepting the Christian faith if intelligently preached. But I would emphasize these words "intelligently preached." I believe that the great need of the age is the gospel of Christ, the Christian Faith ; the great revelation of reality, of the purpose and aim of human life made known to us in Christ. I believe that wherever that is intelligently preached in a way which responds to modern needs, people will come to hear it. I believe that that is what appeals to the best minds of the present day. But you who have to preach it must be intelligent. There is no room for ignorance, for fundamentalism, for an obstinate adherence to old-fashioned views, for mental sluggishness. Every clergyman must learn to use his mind to teach the message with which he has been entrusted in a manner which will appeal to the intellect, will rouse the emotions and stir the imagination of his hearers.

v

We have considered the mission, the message, and some of the defects of the Church of England ; we

pass to our last great question, the relation of the Church of England to other religious communions. The Church of England should be the Church of the whole English people—and it is not. The Catholic Church should unite all the nations of the world—and it does not. We believe that our message is the universal Gospel, the Catholic Faith ; that the Faith is one and the Church should be one.

At the present day, I do not think that there is anything more needful for the world than the spiritual unity of mankind. If we were all one in Christ, how much easier would be the great international problems which perplex us. If all the nations of the world were really Christian, how much simpler would be the government of the world. The extension of the Gospel throughout the world and the restoration of Christian unity are the two great problems before us.

It seemed to those who organized the Congress that the time had come when we must no longer discuss these matters in a one-sided way, but that we must ask those who belong to other communions to tell us what in their opinion are the relations of the Churches which they represent to the Church of England. They have cordially responded to our invitation, and I must in your name and on your behalf welcome to the Congress the very distinguished men who have come to address us : Archbishop Germanos, who presides over the Greek congregations of Western Europe, a representative of the Orthodox Eastern Church who knows intimately our English Church life ; Bishop Ammundsen, Bishop of Haderslev in Denmark, an old friend of my own, who will represent

the Episcopal Lutheran Churches of Scandinavia ; Dr. Adolf Deissmann, one of the most distinguished German theologians, with whose works many of you are acquainted, who will speak with authority for the reorganized Church of Germany, in whose councils he has great weight ; Lord Sands, one of the leading laymen of the Church of Scotland, who has played a great part in the promotion of unity in that country ; Dr. Garvie, an able and trilingual chairman of many of our meetings at Lausanne, with whom I worked for many years in the Faculty of Theology in the University of London ; Professor Lofthouse, a learned and distinguished member of the Wesleyan Communion, and the Rev. G. Phillips, who will speak for the United Church of South India.

I much regret that we did not feel that it was possible to invite any representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. We would have been glad to do so, but so long as the Pope and the English Roman Catholics adopt the unfriendly attitude that they do towards other Christians, it is difficult for the many members of the Roman Catholic Church in other countries to confer with us as they would gladly do. When a pronouncement like that of the Pope condemning all friendly relations with other Christian Churches is issued, it is a sign not of the strength of the position which he is occupying, but of the weakness. We know that there are many members of the Roman Catholic Church in all countries who are dissatisfied with the tyranny of the Italian Curia and resent the intolerant attitude that it adopts towards modern thought. The Malines Conference has taught us that there are those who would be glad to confer with us.

I have had some testimony that there are those in the Roman Church who think the Encyclical a mistake, and even some who intend to ignore it. But at present, at any rate, we can only wait. I believe that in the Church of Rome there are movements of thought which even its discipline will not be able to restrain. I would only say that however difficult it may sometimes be, we should aim at behaving towards that Church in the way in which we desire that it should behave towards fellow-Christians.

But in every other direction the relation of Christian Churches towards one another has changed during the last ten years in a way which we could not have dared to hope for. The war stirred consciences. The Lambeth Conference of 1920, and the Conference on Faith and Order at Lausanne, have had a far-reaching effect. At any rate, the great body of Christians throughout the world desire to behave like Christians to one another. At any rate, there is among many people a real desire for unity.

The time has not yet come for drawing up schemes for Christian unity, but I should like to put before you a few points for your careful consideration.

The first is that the basis of reunion must be the full acceptance of the gospel of Christ, the Catholic Faith. Do not think that you can bring people together on any form of reduced Christianity. It is no easier to believe half Christianity than the whole. Arianism only appeared satisfactory to shallow minds. It is only a full belief in the revelation through Jesus Christ that will stir people's hearts and arouse their enthusiasm. We want the Catholic Faith—but don't make any mistake as to what the Catholic Faith is.

It has little or nothing to do with the thousand and one trivial things which some people call Catholic. The Catholic Faith means the fundamental truths of Christianity. The Catholic Faith means the Incarnation, the Atonement, the Trinity. It means what is contained in the Nicene Creed—the only Catholic Creed. The use of that Creed may to some Christian consciences cause difficulties, but it both positively and negatively teaches us that Catholic Faith which is the gospel of Christ, on which alone we can unite.

Secondly, we are aiming not at a loose federation of Churches, but at the creation of one united corporate body, with certain fundamental principles of unity, however much diversity of life and worship there may be. In particular there must be a unified ministry. What is needful is that every Christian minister should without doubt or misgiving be recognized to be a minister of the Word and Sacraments in the Universal Church.

Thirdly, such a unified ministry and such a united corporate society, with its fundamental principles of unity and its wide diversity of life and custom, can come only through the Episcopate, the historical Episcopate, an episcopacy constitutional and representative. Our model must be the Church of the early centuries, the Church of Ignatius and Irenaeus and Cyprian, where the bishop was the representative of his people and acted in due conference with his clergy and laity. We do not want prelacy, we want episcopacy. And I believe that it is only through episcopacy that the Church will obtain that strong but elastic organization which it needs at the present day.

Fourthly, in no scheme of reunion must we ask

for any form of reordination, whether provisional or otherwise. Some of my friends say that they would be willing to be reordained provisionally for the sake of unity. I believe that that would be a mistake. I have known others who have stated that they would be reordained once, but not oftener. They do not desire to be reordained once for union with the Anglican Church, a second time with the Orthodox, and a third time with Rome. I think this shows the ludicrousness of any scheme based on reordination. We should none of us do anything to deny the spiritual validity of our own Orders, nor must we ask this of any other Church. We may do all that is necessary to ensure the complete validity of the Orders of the united Church. We may do anything that is required to guard the consciences of our people during the interim period ; but nothing in history or theology justifies us in telling others that their Orders and Sacraments are of no avail.

Fifthly, within these principles of unity we must recognize the possibility of freedom and variety. There must be no definition attempting to fix or to limit eucharistic belief ; there must be great freedom of worship ; there must be no attempt to impose opinions on the many subordinate points on which Christians have differed. We want an ordered liberty ; we do not want uniformity.

I do not think it will be easy to overcome the differences and prejudices which have been built up by the separation of the Churches. It is not possible in a few years of goodwill to conquer the work of centuries. I doubt if any of my generation are likely to see many fruits of our work. Union will begin

perhaps in the Mission Field. But whatever difficulties may be, let us work with faith and hope and charity in the great task of bringing the Christian Churches nearer together.

VI

I have completed the task which I undertook. My desire has been to put before you, as the ideal for which we ought to work, the creation of a Free, United, National Church, binding together in one society all the people of this country, itself a part of a Free, United, Catholic Church, which may help to bring together the nations of the world in a spiritual union. I would put this before you as a vision which may inspire you, as a goal fitting to arouse your enthusiasm.

But I am met with an objection. I am told that such an ideal is too vague to command your allegiance ; that it is the smaller society, the Anglo-Catholics, or the Bible Christians, or the Plymouth Brethren, who represent the exclusiveness, the enthusiasm, the self-sacrifice, the eager work of Christianity. Now I admit that there is a hectic and excited enthusiasm which can be aroused by these one-sided causes. Papalism, Anglo-Catholicism, Protestantism are all capable of arousing strong and narrow convictions. They carry people away for a time. The sobriety of Anglicanism seems to some dull. But I do not believe that these partisan enthusiasms are either healthy or permanent. They do not ultimately satisfy. They never attain more than a limited success, for their basis is narrow. They suit shallow minds, who are attracted by half-truths, which do not ultimately or

widely satisfy. They remind one of the seed sown on the rock. It springs up rapidly because there is no depth of earth, but it lasts only for a time and very quickly withers away. Nor are they healthy. Because what is partial and incomplete does not produce a high type of character. There is always something unsatisfying about the religious partisan. His sense of proportion is wrong. He cares for the unimportant things too much. He does not commend Christianity to the world. The great men, even if they have been leaders or founders of a party, have not been partisans. Wesley did not preach Wesleyanism, but the Gospel. Wesleyanism arose through the circumstances of the times. Newman was never an Anglo-Catholic in the modern sense or a Papalist. He did not care for the things they care for. His aim in life was to find a satisfactory authority for the Christian Faith. It was the Christian Faith that he cared for. I do not think that he ever found his authority, for what he was seeking was what the world cannot give, intellectual certainty. "Now we see in a glass darkly." Luther did not wish to found Lutheranism, but to be able to preach freely the gospel of salvation. St. Paul did not preach Paulinism, but the Gospel. Paulinism was an accidental and temporary by-product of the controversies of the day. The great religious teachers have been great not because they were leaders of a party, but because they preached Christ.

And experience corroborates this. The religious partisan is not really successful. He flourishes for a time. He can collect out of a large city a number of people like-minded with himself, but always I find

that it is those who preach the gospel of Christ in an intelligent way, whether they be High or Low, Evangelical or Anglo-Catholic, who win souls to Christ. The party cry is a hindrance, not a help. The men who made Evangelicalism and the men who made Anglo-Catholicism did so because they were earnest and intelligent Christians. Their successors confuse the accidental with the essential. We must put Christ first and the Church second if we are to win the world to Christ and His Church.

And so without hesitation and without misgiving I put before you this ideal : the Church of England as a great National Church, binding together the people as disciples of Christ, the Catholic Church binding the nations in a spiritual union, building up a higher and a better humanity ; and I ask whether this is not a more inspiring aim than any partial presentation of Christianity, and whether it is not the ideal which will appeal most to the generations of mankind rising up around us—to those in whose hands is the future of the world ?

THE NATIONAL CHURCH

THE NATIONAL CHURCH AND THE PAPACY

BY THE REV. J. P. WHITNEY, D.D., DIXIE PROFESSOR
OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, CAMBRIDGE

THE English Church, as an organized body, begins with the mission of St. Augustine. To the older British Church we owe a great spiritual debt. But it stood largely aloof until later days. To the devoted Celtic missionaries of the North our debt is even greater. From the Synod of Whitby (A.D. 664) onwards they gradually fell into line with the newcomers who looked to Rome—the greatest city of Western civilization, the one Apostolic see of the West.

St. Augustine's mission came from Rome, with its inherited wisdom and its power of organization. It was sent by St. Gregory, the greatest man of a crucial age. And he felt his responsibility in keeping the Western Church together. To him, and afterwards to Theodore of Tarsus, we owe our diocesan organization with its two Provinces of North and South. Thus the spirit of our nation's Church was clothed, and we can trace its later growth. But the Holy Spirit was working there as it was in the older Rome. There were, as we may say, churches at Corinth and at Antioch, as at Jerusalem itself. In

tracing our Church history we must tread over fields of controversy, but the spirit of controversy I would avoid.

The essence of the Church's constitution was its Episcopate in touch with the national life and also with local needs and feelings. To keep these ends in view, along with allegiance to the Catholic Faith, is indeed the secret strength of the Episcopate, and we can see its work. Regard for Rome there certainly was: St. Gregory could not be forgotten. Bede speaks for us all. The Church of his day was hardly national, but a true instinct told him it was to be so: already it had the spirit which inspired the growing frame. Yet Bede was no modern Romanist; on the Petrine texts in the New Testament he says expressly that what our Lord gave and said to the spokesman St. Peter, He spake and gave to all the Apostles.¹ Bede was an English Churchman with an historic and prophetic mind.

But we are told that the essence of the Church with its continuity lies not in this historic growth, this widespread spirit moulding the local life, but in the bond of submission to the Papacy. I must test this claim for the pre-Norman Church.

Test it by the pallium and its story. It meant a link with Rome, perhaps as a special relic of St. Peter hallowed by a night at his tomb. But in the days of St. Gregory it had not the meaning given it in later times, which grew with growing Papal claims.

We find, for instance, a Council at Mâcon (A.D. 581) ordering every bishop to wear it at Mass. Centuries later copyists, who only knew later usage, were after-

¹ Migne: *P.L.*, vol. 94; Sermon XVI, Col. 222.

wards puzzled and altered bishop to archbishop ;¹ and a little earlier Fulgentius, a North African bishop (A.D. 458–538) of ascetic taste, was held peculiar for declining to wear such an ornamental vestment. Clearly we are at an early stage of its use.

But its later use and meaning is sometimes boldly carried back to earlier days. And it is also claimed that along with it went the oath of Papal obedience.² Were this true, it would make Papal Supremacy a comparatively early thing. The process of history formed, on the one hand, the National Church, and, on the other, the Papal Power. The question in debate is—which of these two was the essential link with the Primitive Church? History alone can give the answer, and so we have our test. We can apply it to the pallium and the Papal control of metropolitans.

St. Augustine received the pallium with its meaning then. His successors, Laurentius and Mellitus, did not. Papal approval was sought when St. Gregory's Plan for the English provinces was changed ; so, too, for Offa's ill-fated and somewhat discreditable Archbishopric of Lichfield. But, on the other hand, the division of the West Saxon dioceses was made, as Bede says, by decree of an English synod.³ As for York it was unfortunate that St. Paulinus, although consecrated for York in A.D. 625, did not receive the pallium until nine years later, after he had fled

¹ Hefele-Leclercq, *Historie des Conciles*, III, p., 203 (Leclercq's note), and Bruns, *Canones* ; Berlin, 1839. Vol. II, p. 243. (Canon VI.)

² As, for instance, by Cardinal Bourne in his Easter-day Sermon at York (1927), and a little later by Monsignor Canon Howlett in letters to the *Yorkshire Herald*.

³ Bede : *Historia Ecclesiastica Gentis Anglorum*. Bk. V, c. 18.

finally from York to Rochester.¹ But what of the oath to the Pope? All well-known historians are agreed to-day, so far as my fairly wide knowledge of them goes, that this oath made its first appearance in the days of Gregory VII. The well-known Roman Catholic scholar, Funk, sums the matter up in his much-used manual: "Metropolitans were compelled to promise canonical obedience to the Pope. An oath to this effect was demanded by Gregory VII in certain special instances and for motives of Church policy. Gregory IX made this law general. Martin V extended the obligation to bishops also."² [Gregory VII, 1071-85; Gregory IX, 1227-41; Martin V, 1417-31.] This summary describes a development, beginning in the eleventh century, enlarging in the thirteenth and fifteenth. But there is no trace of evidence that any archbishop either took the oath or was asked to do so until late in the eleventh century.

Nor was papal intervention seen to a large extent in episcopal appointments? Historians agree that up to the eleventh century bishop swere appointed usually (but perhaps wrongly) by the kings, sometimes the local chapters, and in England the King's Witan, being consulted. Between 688 and 1050 there were consecrated 376 English bishops, and in no single case is there any sign of a papal share either in appointment or consecration.³

¹ Bede: V, c. 24, and II, c. 17 (with the notes in Plummer's edition).

² Funk: *Manual of Church History* (English trans. 1910), Vol I, p. 360.

³ This is a calculation by Fr. Puller in his very useful and accurate book, *Orders and Jurisdiction*, note, p. 158. I have verified it for myself.

As Stubbs puts it, "the dioceses were the kingdoms," and even before these kingdoms became one there was much national action. It was the first stage in a long process: the papal influence, when it was exercised, was mostly for good; it sought to advise and guide, to inspire from within, not to rule from outside. "There was no Roman legation from the days of Theodore (A.D. 668-90) to those of Offa (A.D. 789), and only scanty traces of such interference for the next three centuries. Dunstan boldly refused to obey a papal sentence." So Stubbs. And again: "It was to an extraordinary degree a national Church."¹

In the ninth century we find Nicholas I and John VIII striving to extend their control. Nicholas, in his answer to the Bulgarians, says that all metropolitans, before acting as such, must get the pallium. John VIII, in a council at Ravenna (A.D. 877) (Canon I) ordered all metropolitans to apply for it within three months of consecration. Without it they were not to (as St. Paulinus did and as St. Anselm was to) consecrate others. St. Boniface tried, not too successfully, to get it used in Germany; his successor Lull, e.g., remained many years without it, and we find John VIII reproaching Frankish bishops for their lack of obedience in the matter. The ninth century thus marks a new stage, in which Popes press the pallium, but its use is far from general.²

I pass to the Anglo-Norman period when England

¹ All these references are to the *Constitt. Hist.* I. c. VIII. (I give the chapter as pages vary in different editions.)

² For Nicholas I, Migne, *P.L.*, Vol. CXIX, Col. 1007, and John VIII to Rostagnus of Arles, Vol. CXXVI. Col. 775.

passed from isolation into a larger world and ties with Rome grew closer. Gregory VII wished to see England, like Sicily, held by the Normans as a papal fief. It was a hope which, dashed by the Conqueror, was realized for a time under John and Henry III with bad results. William, though faithful to the Papacy, ruled for Church and State in England as he had done in Normandy. Under him and Lanfranc, and their successors, English and Normans grew together. For some two centuries our Church life was vigorous; Councils were more frequent, and local efficiency, under archdeacons and rural deans, greater.

The English Church was really changing less than was the Papacy, which was now organizing its College of Cardinals; drawing to itself more of business, ecclesiastical and legal. Papal claims grew larger and more urgent. We find, e.g., Paschal II (1099-1118) explaining to a Sicilian Archbishop why he should take the oath of obedience on receiving the pallium sent him. But he had demurred; he could find nothing about the oath in Canons or elsewhere; it was a novelty and his prince objected to his taking it. The Pope's reply, afterwards embodied in the Canon Law, is illuminating. He alleges no early precedents, but bases the demand on his own sufficient power. So a Pope and a Sicilian Archbishop of the day seem to regard the oath as a novelty of the eleventh century, as historians do.¹ Papal opposition to Imperial claims, mainly righteous to begin with, as I take it, changed into strife waged with the arms of flesh but supported by religious means. To

¹ For one like letter of Paschal II see Migne, *P.L.*, CLXIII, *Col.* 428, *Ep.* DVI.

carry on the warfare for Papal ends the local churches were to be taxed. Hence came demands for money, which not only caused irritation but damaged the working of the Church. To give details would be easy ; I give two. In 1226 Honorius III sent a legate to demand the setting aside of one prebend in every cathedral or collegiate church for Papal needs ; in 1228 Gregory IX demanded one-tenth of clerical income for his crusade against Frederick II. King and Pope often worked together in episcopal appointments and also in taxation : so that the clergy were doubly ground down. Irritation against the Papacy intensified national feeling among Churchmen and barons alike. How the nation grew together the history of our Parliament tells us. We have reached another stage.

By the end of the thirteenth century papal control was established in England as elsewhere in a way unknown before. The Canon Law, which had grown so quickly and so greatly, was recognized as binding. Here we reach the controversy between F. W. Maitland and Stubbs. For myself, I take Maitland's view, and saying so I pass it by. The reasons for the acceptance of Canon Law and the history of its growth are another matter.

There were some gains ; the legislation of Alexander III on patronage and benefices, for instance, is the basis of our present system. But later on gains were less and complications greater. Above all the recognized sovereign of Canon Law was the Pope, and his will was arbitrary. Appeals to Rome were over-numerous and injurious to local religious interests.

But we must not assume that papal control was solely forced upon England from outside. Priests and philosophers were everywhere much the same, and there was a common international opinion. They supported Papal Supremacy on theoretical or dogmatic grounds, misled sometimes, as was St. Thomas Aquinas himself, by forgeries, which we can criticize as they could not. Moreover, the Papacy was often a convenient refuge for those who were, or thought themselves, oppressed, and for those who had some private end to gain.

Papal rule in the Church and kingly rule in the State, two kindred magistracies in one great Christian society for the West: this was the current medieval settlement of the ever-present and ever-pressing problem of Church and State. It was slowly reached by process of history more than by fundamental ideas. It was difficult always to fix the limits of the entangled spheres. Nor is it easy to say why, on the side of the Church, a permanent sanction should be claimed for this particular late medieval solution. It had no sufficient support in the early Church: it was, as I have tried to show, not at work in the same way in early medieval days. It came slowly into being from the eleventh to the thirteenth century, and for a short time worked at its strongest. Here, on one hand, we touch a great argument upon which I cannot enter now; on the other hand matters of history.

In the earlier centuries the Papacy, under Gregory the Great for instance, had stood and striven for the unity of the Western Church. It was a noble task and a great responsibility. We may compare it with some-

thing on a smaller scale. A man sees his vocation, and tries to reach some good end in his own way. But soon, sweetness of his own way overpowers the good end; the enforcement of his own will becomes the task he loves; his ideal is overcome by a kind of selfishness. It was so to a great extent with the Papacy. No longer was the unity of the Western Church its sole end. It must be gained in its own way. The plenitude of Papal power was now what it stood for. It was so at the Reformation; it was to be so at Trent, and it was to be hallowed, as it were, in 1870.

The evils I have mentioned were not all of them temporary abuses which would disappear with time; many were part of the historical process, and even furthered the growth of the papal power. During the closing Middle Ages they grew, as every candid historian admits, greater and more destructive. I do not wish to speak at length of the Papacy of Avignon (A.D. 1309-78) with its inner sadness and outward splendour. Interference or bargains with governments, heavy taxation of the churches, inroads on patronage, abuse of fees, all grew commoner. There was a great increase in business of all kinds, due to papal centralization. But this excuse is not enough. There was great disregard of local needs and interests. Nearly everything was sacrificed to the Papacy; there was great extravagance, for the Cardinals at Avignon were no exponents of the simple life.

The Papal Schism and its twofold Papacy made things even worse. And it turned the minds of men to the fundamental question: Where lay the sovereignty of the Church on earth? The great theo-

logians of Paris answered that it lay in a General Council, supreme over all, even over the Pope. The Council of Constance, which recorded this decision, was organized by nations. The English representatives gave a strong defence of their national organization, and indeed played there no ignoble part. The learning of that great age and scene was inherited by later Gallicanism and was a storehouse for our Elizabethan and Caroline divines. If the Papacy did emerge from the Conciliar Age to grow strong under Martin V and his successors, it did so by Concordats with the several nations. A new day with new problems began for the Papacy as for the world at large. But papal care was now overmuch concerned with the Temporal States and Italian policies.

Corruption remained and the much-needed reform tarried. Take one extreme instance from the eve of the Reformation. Cardinal Innocenzo Cibo, a kinsman of Leo X, held ten bishoprics, besides abbeys and lesser benefices; yet Leo strove to get for him one more See in Scotland.¹ To this the Papacy had sunk. Nor can we avoid the judgment of Lord Acton, that the refusal of reforms was not due to the corruptions of courtiers, but to the plenitude claimed for papal power.²

The last two centuries of the Middle Ages, with the consolidation of the great nations, saw the real breakdown of the papal system, although the weight

¹ This instance is quoted by V. Martin, *Le Gallicanisme et la Réforme Catholique* [Paris, 1919], p. vii. Also Hefele-Leclercq, *Les Conciles*, VIII, p. 545.

² Lord Acton: *Historical Essays and Studies*, p. 439.

of custom, the arts of diplomacy, and dogmatic arguments might dress it up anew. Fortunately for us, the English Church had still in many ways kept its ancient constitution and internal rule. Indeed, during the interregnum (over two years) before the election of Martin V at Constance (11 Nov. 1417), the English Church returned to its old and national constitution without any Papal encroachments on its liberty.¹ Theoretically, the old Episcopate remained with all its power and vitality, even if they had been overlaid by custom and by Papal rule. Throughout the Middle Ages it had strengthened both religion and its hold upon the national life, while the Papacy had disregarded English liberties and damaged the working of the national Church.

That great scholar Lord Acton called England "the country which has preserved the Catholic forms in its Church establishment more than any other Protestant nation, and the Catholic spirit in its political institutions more than any Catholic nation."² This noble achievement is due, I confidently claim, to that mediæval history which formed our National Church, sent it forth, equipped to weather the Reformation storms, and to become what it is to-day—even more, what it can be to-morrow. In its free Episcopate it has kept the ideal of earlier days to be still more fruitful in years to come, while elsewhere the Papacy has absorbed all power to itself. Which is the truer development?

Under the Papacy visitations and synods, the handmaids of religious work, had been too much neglected.

¹ Puller : *Orders and Jurisdictions*, p. 176 seq.

² Lord Acton : *History of Freedom*, p. 211.

But parish life was more vigorous.¹ A Venetian ambassador in 1500 was struck by the simple piety of English people, whose attendance at daily offices was like that of monks elsewhere. Local religious life was strong; the Church's constitution had guarded the Faith, which is its true and abiding task.

Colet's celebrated Convocation sermon (1512) sketches the way in which the Church could work. In the new age it came to understand better the teaching of the past. Its appeal was to the primitive Church, and later history has justified it. The freedom of the Episcopate, linked to the parochial life, was the essence of the Church's system. It had suffered greatly, there were abuses not to be defended, but it was to regain its strength along with its freedom. It could look back to its past and even amid dangers and revolution there find its hope and strength. Both its hope and its strength were to grow with its years.

¹ Some details are collected in E. Fueter: *Religion und Kirche in England* [Tübingen, 1904], p. 39.

THE REFORMATION AND THE NATIONAL CHURCH

BY THE REV. CLAUDE JENKINS, D.D., F.S.A.,
PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, KING'S COLLEGE,
LONDON

THE Reformation is not a complete drama, though it has many scenes. But a movement which left its mark upon the whole of Western Christendom is something far more than an episode. In England a Church historically Catholic and temperamentally Protestant passes through a period of crisis to emerge Catholic, Protestant and Reformed: I do not see why we should be ashamed or afraid of any of the three epithets or adopt an attitude of apology equally uncalled for and undignified. To its leaders and probably to the vast majority of the English people it remained the same entity whose ethos the Roman Curia had so frequently misunderstood—the Church of England. Yet it is absurd to minimize the gravity of the issues raised. The assertion of Article XXXVII of 1571 that ‘the Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England’ crystallizes in a statement of fact a theory which is certainly novel. Discoveries are often disconcerting, but they are not therefore necessarily to be rejected. And this was in logical sequence to the negative answer given in 1534 to

the question 'Has the Roman Pontiff any greater jurisdiction conferred on him by God in holy Scripture in this realm of England than any other foreign bishop?' I am not concerned to argue—from most points of view it seems to me meaningless to say—that thereby 'the primitive independence of the British Church was canonically restored.' I merely note the implication that the recognition of Roman jurisdiction was not necessary either to the integrity or completeness of the Church's life.

It is, however, commonly said that the King was put into the place of the Pope and that a Church which had thus given to Caesar the things that are God's had forfeited its status. But those who held rightly or wrongly that the Roman Papacy was a human institution could fairly deny the inference; and it is besides only with strict limitation true that the King was put in the Pope's place. The stately preamble of the Act in Restraint of Appeals in 1533 which declared this realm of England to be historically an 'Impire . . . governed by oon Supreme heede and King . . . unto whome a Body politike compacte of all sortes and degrees of people, devided in termes and by names of Spiritualltie and Temporaltie, ben bounden and owen to bere nexte to God a naturall and humble obedience' declared two other things in the same context: (a) the king's competence by the 'goodnes and sufferaunce of Almyghtie God' to 'rendre and yelde Justice and finall determynacion . . . in all causes' occurring within the realm 'without restraynt or provocation to any foreyn Princes or Potentates of the World'; and (b) that the 'Body Spirituall' of the realm was competent in that 'whan

any cause of the Lawe devine happened to comme in question or of spirituall lernyng, then it was declared interprete and shewed by that parte of the said bodye politike called the Spiritualtie nowe beyng usually called the Englishe Church.¹ The Act for the Submission of the Clergy in the following year² and the 'Peter's Pence' Act which provided for dispensations³ are interpretations and limitations. In form the Act of 1534 which declares the king 'the onely supremee head in erthe of the Church of England' goes much further.⁴ It enacts that the king shall have full powers in relation to visiting repressing . . . and amending heresies etc. 'whiche by any maner spirituall auctoryte or jurisdiction ought or maie lawfullye be reformed repressyd ordered redressyd correctyd restrayned or amendyd, moste to the pleasure of Almyghtie God the encrease of vertue yn Christis Religion and for the conservation of the peace unyted and tranquyltye of this Realme: any usage custome foreyne lawes foreyne auctoryte prescripcion or anye other thinge or thinges to the contrarie hereof notwithstandinge.' 'Foreyn Princes or Potentates,' 'foreyne lawes,' 'foreyne auctoryte'—always the reference is external, and though Fisher was right in saying that the Statute was 'like a two-edged sword' and the interpretation in practice varied, and under cover of it some monstrous things were done, yet generally speaking in its internal reference the claim does not necessarily go further than that made by Elizabeth's Supremacy Act, and if so the interpretation placed upon the

¹ 24 Hen. 8 c. 12.

² 25 Hen. 8 c. 19.

³ 25 Hen. 8 c. 21.

⁴ 26 Hen. 8 c. 1.

claims of Henry VIII and Edward VI in the 'Admonition to simple men' added after the fifty-third of the Elizabethan Injunctions is the right interpretation.¹ Such a claim, like all other claims, is always open to abuse ; but it has in it nothing either contrary to the law of God or constitutionally unsound.

I turn now to another aspect. In Article XIX of 1571 it was declared that 'the visible Church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in the which the pure Word of God is preached, and the Sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.' Those words are not alternative but complementary to the statement in the Preface to the Ordinal that 'it is evident unto all men diligently reading holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles time there hath been these orders of Ministers in Christs Church, Bishops Priests and Deacons.' The twofold appeal to Scripture and ancient Authors was the means whereby the English Reformers were saved from many eccentricities and many blunders. Differing in opinion, though one in intention, by that means they preserved continuity of ministry apart from theory and decency of order apart from caprice. When Bacon in the *Advancement of Learning* includes among 'the four main branches of divinity' faith manners liturgy and government, he is using words in a sense they well understood. Among the historical documents of the English Church few, whether before or since

¹ Printed in *Visitation Articles and Injunctions of the Period of the Reformation*, ed. W. H. Frere (Longmans, 1920), iii, 25-26.

the Reformation, are of greater interest than the several prefaces to the Book of Common Prayer. On the one hand freedom is claimed, on the other in a fashion equally characteristic uniformity is ensued. So far as concerned statutory enactments the successive Acts of Uniformity may have been measures of State policy, even of self-preservation, however mistakenly conceived. But to the English ecclesiastical authorities the successive regulations of worship and discipline had not only the merit of intrinsic reasonableness, since they had themselves agreed upon them, but also the authority of Scripture and the primitive Church. Doubtless they were not wholly consistent: they retained, and the canons of 1604 for example certainly defend, many things that have no such warrant. Looking back we can hardly be surprised if the foreign Reformers found the English temperament as difficult to understand as the Roman Curia had done. And here there is something further to be remembered. The Precisians, the Puritans and most of the bodies of English dissenters from the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England were protagonists not of lawlessness, still less of anarchy or of antinomianism, but of a different, in some cases certainly a severer, kind of uniformity. The works of Cartwright, the records of the Hampton Court Conference, the Westminster Assembly, the Savoy Conference, give scant encouragement for modern advocates of a genial nebulosity. We may think that the English Puritans, conforming and nonconforming, and the foreign Reformers were sometimes right, often hard to please. But the English ecclesiastical authorities for the most part

knew their own minds and held on their own course. If, to use Archbishop Bramhall's simile, the Church of England was a weeded garden which the ultra-reformers thought very badly weeded, to the Church's leaders it was at any rate their garden which they had inherited from their fathers and it was they, and not others, who were its rightful keepers. We shall hardly deny that they regarded with undue complacency what an eighteenth-century Dean of Canterbury once called 'the purest of Churches' and fostered for centuries before and after the Reformation abuses which ought, in Laud's phrase, to have caused a 'sciatica of the conscience' but did not. They were often shortsighted and sometimes tyrannical like their critics, but they had a sanity added to learning which restrained them from replacing the old scholasticism by the burden of the new, and they had sincere belief in the guidance of the Spirit which enabled them to retrieve some failures to recognize His working.

I must hasten to my third topic—the attitude of the English bishops to foreign Reformed bodies. Some like the refugees at Canterbury were recipients of a hospitality which has now lasted three and a half centuries. With them there was no intermixture of rites between those who had received Presbyterian ordination and those episcopally ordained. Laud would have had them conform but they refused, and this illustrates the traditional English attitude before and after. It seems to me impossible to deny that the English bishops recognized the foreign Churches as Churches. 'We may be and are,' said Laud, 'of the same religion ; and yet "agree" not

with them in those opinions in which we differ from them.' It seems to me equally impossible to deny that there are probably isolated cases of men not episcopally ordained having ministered in the Church of England. But it is not merely probable, it is certain that such cases indicate no weakening at any time of the Anglican view of the ministry contained in the Ordinal nor of what was requisite in England. The Frenchman who was granted by Sancroft in December 1681 a faculty to receive Deacon's and Priest's Orders at the same time on the ground of having 'good testimony of his conversation and abilities for undertaking the Office of Ministry according to y^e Discipline of the Protestant or Reform'd Churches of France' was being treated exceptionally in being dispensed from the interval usual between the conferring of the two Orders: he was being treated normally according to the ideas and practice of a man who shewed greater friendship to members of the foreign Reformed Churches than perhaps any other Archbishop of Canterbury. Such men would at any rate have a ministry recognized within the whole Body at least so far as the co-operation of both sides could secure it. It is the spirit of Thorndike's *Due Way of Composing Differences*, written in 1660. The article 'One Catholic Church,' he says, 'either signifies nothing: or it signifies, that God hath founded one visible Church; that is, that He hath obliged all Churches (and all Christians, of whom all Churches consist) to hold visible communion with the whole Church in the visible offices of God's public service.' 'And therefore,' Thorndike adds, 'I am satisfied that the differ-

ences, upon which we are divided, cannot be justly settled upon any terms, which any part of the whole Church shall have just cause to refuse, as inconsistent with the unity of the whole Church. For, in that case, we must needs become schismatics ; by settling ourselves upon such laws, under which any Church may refuse to communicate with us, because it is bound to communicate with the whole Church.' But for the realization of that unity each Church as it seems to me will have something to receive as well as to give. If it be said that I have neglected to consider whether, however excellent its intention to do that which our Lord Himself and His Apostles and the Fathers of the Church alike intended, the National Church in relation to the Reformation did in fact retain the things that were essential, the answer is that in that matter like all other Churches reformed or unreformed it is subject to the judgment of God. So far as historical evidence goes it has nothing to make it afraid.

THE GROWTH OF NONCONFORMITY

BY THE REV. CANON E. W. WATSON, D.D.,
REGIUS PROFESSOR OF ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, OXFORD

WE are apt to think that the religious revolution of the sixteenth century was a sudden outbreak. But serious people were expecting it before Luther was heard of. Five years before his protest, a special meeting of the Canterbury Convocation was summoned to consider what measures should be taken to overcome the rising danger of heresy. The one remarkable thing about the meeting was the sermon by Dean Colet of St. Paul's, who denounced the secular lives of the leading clergy in the presence of the Archbishop, who was also Lord Chancellor of England. The Church was, in fact, thoroughly secularized. Bishops were either meritorious Civil Servants, promoted to save the King the cost of their stipends, or younger sons of the nobility. The whole service of the Crown was in the hands of clergy, who were nominally the King's chaplains and so canonically qualified to hold benefices without residence. But these were abuses insignificant in comparison with those sanctioned by the Canon Law, the effect of which was that a dispensation, which had its price, enabled any clergyman to hold any preferment without fulfilling its duties. Orthodox were as un-

sparing in their criticism as heretics; and doubt inevitably extended from the phenomena to their cause. This was the current doctrine of the Mass. It was a miracle, which was of equal value whoever performed it, and therefore the beneficed priest inflicted no injury on his parish if he were absent, provided he furnished a substitute, however illiterate and ill-paid, to perform the function. And, in fact, one may almost say that the beneficed were usually non-resident. When we see the "parish priest" recorded as witness to a will in the later Middle Ages, it always means, not the incumbent, but a curate in charge. Not that England was worse than other countries of Western and Central Europe, but it was no better.

This was felt most keenly by those who were most devout. The Mystical movement which has excited so much interest and admiration among us of late years was not only a revival of religion, but a protest against current abuses, and even against practices, edifying enough themselves, but which seemed to be consistent with, and to give their sanction to, the evils of the time. The greatest of the English Mystics, Richard Rolle of Hampole, spoke with contempt of musical Masses. Such observances seemed to be a substitute for spiritual religion.

When such abuses were current, and seemed to be infecting the whole of religion, they, and with them the Sacrament which was the occasion of some of them, provoked revolt; and that revolt was the parent of English Dissent. For those who embraced it rebelled not against some particular abuse, but

against the Church, which they regarded as its author ; and they seemed to find a sanction in the protests of men like Rolle. But the first rebels, the Lollards, had the grave fault that they were negative, not constructive. Orthodoxy was never strong enough to suppress them ; they were still being burnt when the first Reformers, in the recognized sense, began to share their punishment. What the new movement contributed was a clear working theory, or rather two such theories, which made the opposition seem reasonable. One of them was the Presbyterian, which here had little permanent success. It postulated an authoritative national Church, and therefore, *mutatis mutandis*, was on a level with the existing English church and invited comparison with it. That comparison was naturally, in most English minds, unfavourable, for the rival was Scottish in its most conspicuous and successful presentation.

The really successful substitute was attractive to many earnest minds because it offered something entirely new. This was the rejection of the whole idea of an organized Christianity, whether the Church was conceived as universal or local. It was assumed that the little Pauline churches were a pattern Divinely appointed for all subsequent time. They were independent of each other ; were, in fact, separate congregations united only by sympathy. They consisted only of members who had voluntarily and deliberately joined them, and had been, with equal freedom and deliberation, accepted into the community. Some of these congregations practised baptism of believers only, some that of infants. But these were minor differences. The thing essential

was that the members chose their Church, and that it admitted them ; no larger union was, from their point of view, possible in accordance with Christian principles. Only among the speakers of the English language has this conception gained any vogue ; and Scotland, which heartily accepted the idea of a national Church, has never shown favour to the Congregational scheme.

We have, then, two formidable opponents to the reformation as planned by Henry VIII, which was (to put it bluntly) Catholicism without the Pope. I do not mean that either of them was fully developed as a system of thought or fully self-conscious so early as his day. But it was already inevitable that they should advance to their full, and contradictory, conclusions. Meanwhile we must ask what was the temper of the quiet, and even inert, mass of the clergy and laity. Inert, indeed, it was ; its submission to successive changes is astonishing. Those whose conscience forbade them to obey the new regulations imposed every few years might, in any diocese, be counted on one's fingers. The spectacle is humiliating and grotesque. Thomas Tallis sings in the Chapel Royal steadily from Edward VI to Elizabeth ; the same Vicar-General conducts the business of the See of Worcester under Hugh Latimer, his predecessor and his successor. These are typical specimens from the higher and lower grades of clerical life. It is impossible to be proud of it. We must excuse it by the cynical indifference of Rome, which as yet had not even begun a reformation from within ; and by the high standard of respectability which Henry VIII had introduced among the higher clergy. There had

been an astonishing improvement, and it must have already begun to work downwards.

The first sign that considerable numbers of the clergy preferred conscience to position came with the death of Mary. Let us give all credit to the men who surrendered their posts rather than add another to the changes which they had accepted. We have no right to say that they had acted against their conscience ; rather, that their sense of the seriousness of the issues at stake had not been awakened. At last it was ; and every man of mark among the survivors of those who had supported Henry decided that he must take his stand. Catholicism without the Pope, it seemed, had broken down, and they rallied to the Pope. Almost every bishop, and a majority among the more dignified clergy, refused to acquiesce in the Elizabethan system. As to the rank and file, most of them continued to be dumbly—again, we have no right to say unconscientiously—attached to the society to which they had continuously adhered. They could not have explained their action ; we can see that they were wiser than they knew.

What I wish to emphasize is that our Church, as we know it, is not the direct inheritor of the Henrician position, as it is sometimes called. That had been found untenable by those who had worked most heartily under it and who knew it best. And, in fact, the inrush of new ideas was rapidly altering the Church in a direction which would, if it had not been checked, have destroyed its continuity and its resemblance with its past. The two theories I have mentioned, the Presbyterian and the Congregational, gained more and more vogue. They claimed, both

of them, though only one could be right, that they were Scriptural, that in the Old and New Testament patterns for Church government were laid down to which they conformed. Obviously the existing system did not so conform ; and unhappily many abuses survived from the medieval period to which extremists pointed as evidence that the Church was essentially corrupt. It must be taken to pieces and reconstructed ; reform in detail was a hopeless waste of time. We know what measure of success, what greater measure of failure, befell this assault.

Half-way through the reign of Elizabeth there were, then, three theories, all of them being vigorously and confidently pressed, in antagonism to the existing system of the Church. What was the Church doing by way of reply ? Nothing, said its adversaries ; its friends may have thought despondently that its enemies were winning. But all the while, through life, though without a theory, it was strengthening its position. People were growing accustomed to its ways, and custom grew into affection. Its Prayer Book and its worship, they learned through experience, were good for their souls. And soon they ceased to be content to apologize for their Church. One almost blushes, at this length of time, over the humble attitude of English bishops, whose letters we read in the Parker Society's publications, towards their lords and patrons at Zurich and Geneva. And their younger contemporaries grew equally ashamed. First they felt that their Church was as good as any other among the reformed ; they went to claim stoutly that it was the best of them all. But their understanding could not be satisfied without a theory, an explanation,

that should match the rival theories. And in the nick of time two men of genius, one in thought and the other in administration, Hooker and Bancroft, arose to make the English Church what it is, and to inspire such religion as that of Lancelot Andrewes and George Herbert.

For more than a generation the mind of the English Church had lain fallow ; it was rendered fertile by the rest. It is no discredit that the characteristic principles of our Church were slow in coming to birth, and that they were shaped in controversies forced upon her. May we not rather be thankful that they were not premature, and that we have escaped difficulties in which a hastily improvised scheme of thought would have involved us ? There is, no doubt, a certain discontinuity between the Church as it evolved itself and the Henrician Church which preceded it ; there were differences in sympathy and in thought. But living structures vary because they are alive, and through several later developments of thought we have learned not to trust in the finality of any of the phases through which we have passed, or are passing.

Before I turn to the last serious separation, I must say a word about a mode of thought to which the practical difficulties of the Reformation period gave origin. There was a considerable number of Churches, national or local, in general agreement on many points, and especially in hostility to Rome, yet with conspicuous differences, especially in regard to their ministry. Unity was most desirable, and many good men agreed to differ on that point. They framed the theory that each local Church has the right to appoint

such a ministry as it will, and that no allied Church must criticize another or repudiate its ministry as invalid. How this notion was to be reconciled with the various doctrines of the ministry regarded as Divinely constituted we need not consider. At any rate, it was widely accepted in England ; for instance, it governed the dealings of the future Bishop Ken in his intercourse with the Dutch ministers with whom he came in contact as chaplain to the Princess Mary, wife to William of Orange. Their reformed Church presented them to him as its ministers, and it was not for him to turn his back upon them. Each nation was to be a law to itself as regards its ministry.

When John Wesley organized with consummate ability a religious society which he designed to be permanent and self-contained, he took no step whatever to attach its preachers to the Church of which he was himself a loyal adherent. All that he cared for was that they should be thoroughly in earnest and free from what he regarded as the deadly error of Calvinism. Few of his preachers had been in a serious sense members of the English Church. Where he found teaching like his own he was careful not to disturb the parish which enjoyed it. A good number of his best adherents had been Nonconformists before they joined him. He made them Methodists, but he did not make them Churchmen. They must go to communion at their parish church, but that was a feeble bond of association in comparison with the constant and vivid life of their own society. But the great majority of the Methodists had no religious associations whatever before their conversion ; the Methodist Society was their one and

only spiritual home. Wesley made no attempt to counteract this. He was content that they should be nothing but Methodists, whose communion, though it were usually in church, was to be part of their Methodism. It was inevitable, in such a state of mind, that they should wish to make their society self-sufficing; so, in their founder's lifetime, some of them started communion for themselves. In the long run he gave them his approval, ordaining first for America, where he could plead that no one could do it for him, then for Scotland, finally for England. He had the justification that by the time he reached middle life he had discovered that Presbyterians and Congregationalists were right, and there is only one order of ministry. Therefore he had the same right to transmit it as he had to celebrate the Eucharist. No wonder his successors in the rule of his society took him seriously, and soon made it their rule to commission a ministry by laying on of hands. But now they expressly state that the office is conveyed, not by the rite, but by the authority which they believe is vested in themselves as an autonomous Christian communion. Their position is exactly that in which the allied reformed Churches of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries recognized each other as standing. They ordain in their own way, and expect their allies to recognize a ministry which, acting within their rights, they have constituted as seemed best to themselves.

I have not attempted to criticize these four types of ministry, nor have I ventured to justify our own preference for our own. I have not tried to trace the path by which different schools have come to

think as they do. I am not sure that we deserve the satisfaction and triumph of convincing others. But let me end with a few words of Dean Church in regard to the controversy which ended for Newman in 1845. He is speaking the mind of those who in spite of perplexity maintained their ground. "The English Church was after all as well worth living in and fighting for as any other; it was not only in England that light and dark, in teaching and in life, were largely intermingled, and the mixture had to be largely allowed for." And the last words of Dean Church's admirable history of the Oxford Movement, which are also almost the last of Bishop Stubbs' great Constitutional History, are "Shew thy servants thy work, and their children thy glory."

THE CHURCH AS THE SPIRITUAL ORGAN OF THE NATION

BY THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM

THE *Oxford Dictionary* defines a nation rather
cumbrously thus :

“ An extensive aggregate of persons so associated with each other by common descent, language, or history as to form a distinct race or people, usually organized as a separate state and occupying a definite territory.”

It is, in short, an association of individuals so closely bound together as to be consciously *one*. This unity we must needs clothe with the attributes of personality. It, too, feels, thinks, aspires, acts, rising to heights of corporate virtue, and falling to deeps of corporate vice. There is a national conscience, a national sentiment, a national ideal, and a national Church. The last might fitly be pictured as the equivalent of the individual conscience. This equation is implied in the subject of my paper.

Man is essentially religious, and the fact must needs colour all human associations. Of such associations the Family and the Nation may, perhaps, be regarded as normal, and in some sense natural. Accordingly, these also are essentially religious. Historically, religion is everywhere cast into domestic and national forms, the religion of the hearth and the

religion of the State. The world-religions, which disdain ethnical and territorial limits, emerge on a scene occupied by domestic and localized cults, and though they displace, they do not wholly supersede, what they find. The Home and the State retain a certain indestructible individuality even under the dominance of Religions which are essentially universal.

National Christianity is equally familiar and paradoxical. On the one hand, it is certain that national idiosyncrasy stamps itself subtly, but unmistakably, on the nation's religion, and moulds ecclesiastical institutions on the models of secular polity. Just as the genius of a nation gives distinctive colour to its art, architecture, poetry, and literature, so does it also colour its religion. On the other hand, this process is, in the case of Christianity, conditioned by the essential character of a Religion which is Divine in origin, traditional in substance, and universal in range. That there should exist such strongly marked national and racial types of Christianity as Christian History discloses demonstrates the amazing versatility and assimilative power of the Religion, but cannot alter its primary and indestructible character. In what sense and within what limits can a Christian Church function as the spiritual organ of a nation ?

It needs not that we should dwell long on the obvious and relatively unimportant fact that the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy can serve as the constitutional instrument of the National Will. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy represents the Church more or less successfully. It can never be identified with the Church save at the peril of formidable confusion.

The "mitred front" which an Established Church rears impressively in "courts and parliaments" counts for more in the rhetoric of the Orator than in the reckoning of the Moralist. A Coronation, a National Intercession, a Public Fast, a National Thanksgiving, are corporate acts of the Body Politic by which the general mind is more or less accurately expressed, and the Established Church, that is, the official hierarchy, is the constitutional instrument by which those corporate acts are with decent solemnity performed. Coleridge's distinction between a National Church and Christianity is sound and important. The two may be connected, but they may not. Even when connected, they are never wholly fused, so that it is always possible for them to fall apart. The lower character may assert itself successfully against the higher. A Christian Church may degenerate into the organ of national prejudice, greed, and passion, not checking or correcting these ill forces, but stimulating, directing, and, in a terrible sense, consecrating them. During the Great War the relation of Christianity to the National Churches was forced into an arresting and painful prominence. The well-known French savant, M. Loisy, published in 1915 a little book, *Guerre et Religion*, which formulated the impression which many minds had received. He maintained that Christianity had demonstrably ceased to be the religion of Christendom, and had everywhere been replaced by patriotism. He pointed out that not merely the confessedly National Churches of England, Russia, and Germany, but the confessedly supra-national Roman Catholic Churches in France, Belgium and Austria exhibited the same

spectacle. All were completely accordant with the national policies, and all consecrated with their benedictions the national armies. Just as in the Middle Ages the Crusaders from every part of Christendom found in their Christian Faith a common inspiration, so in modern Christendom the belligerents in the Great War found the governing motive in love of country. If practice be indeed a more trustworthy evidence of actual belief than profession, then, he suggests, we may not resist the conclusion that, in spite of their parade of Christian conviction, the real religion of modern Europeans is Patriotism.

"The Gods which Christianity had supplanted," wrote the eloquent Frenchman, "seem to have risen from the dead. Asshur from Nineveh, Marduk from Babylonia, Ammon from Thebes, Jupiter Capitolinus returns in the God of the Germans. What is the God of the Christians doing? Leaders and peoples act as if they knew Him not. But the earth is still full of His official representatives, and surely they will not be able to remain dumb in the present crisis, the most formidable contradiction of their faith which has ever been made since it came into being."¹

The more frankly a National Church gives expression to purely national moods and emotions, the less distinctively Christian it may be. That does not mean that national moods and emotions ought not to be religiously expressed, but only that their expression, however noble and energizing, is not specifically Christian. Yet it is no small advantage that the expression should be cast into Christian moulds. It is better to sing litanies than to offer the first-born to Moloch at a time of national distress, but the motive is the same in both.

¹ *V. loc. cit.*, p. 50.

“In what relation, then, do you place Christianity to the National Church?” asked Coleridge of himself, and he replies thus :

“In relation to the national Church, Christianity or the Church of Christ, is a blessed accident, a providential boon, a grace of God, a mighty and faithful friend, the envoy, indeed, and liege subject of another state, but which can neither administer the laws nor promote the ends of this other State, which is not of the world, without advantage, direct or indirect, to the true interests of the States, the aggregate of which is what we mean by the world, that is, the civilized world.”¹

The Church has a twofold function within the Nation. On the one hand, it must give religious expression to national moods and emotions, and, on the other hand, it must carry to the Nation those truths which we properly call “spiritual,” as having no lower source than the Divine Spirit Himself. “*The Spirit of man is the Candle of the Lord.*” Within the Nation the Christian Church is as the Conscience within the Individual, the organ through which Divine Illuminations enter the mind and shape the life. For the due performance of the first function a national mandate would seem to be requisite, and this may be given either through a constitutional status guaranteed by the Law, which we are accustomed to call Establishment, or through some direct commission for specific acts such as a Government might give to non-established or disestablished Churches. For the due performance of the last function the essential condition is independence. The Church can only bring to the Nation the moral guidance which it is ordained to bring if it be free

¹ *V. Church and State*, p. 65.

to utter its witness to the truth without hindrance. Like the conscience in the individual, so the Church within the Nation is a Divine Judge, whose verdicts may not be tampered with in deference to material advantage, nor made conformable to the taste of vengeance and vanity. "Religion, true or false," wrote Coleridge, "is and has ever been the centre of gravity in a realm, to which all other things must and will accommodate themselves." To the nation, as to the individual, the supreme disaster is the perversion of this domestic Judge. The words of our Saviour are applicable to both: "*The lamp of the body is the eye: if therefore thine eye be single, thy whole body shall be full of light. But if thine eye be evil, thy whole body shall be full of darkness. If therefore the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is the darkness!*" If Nation and Church were identical, as in the Tudor system idealized and defended by Hooker, the parallel between the National Church and the individual conscience would be exact. The Ecclesiastical Hierarchy would be frankly part of the State system, as it is pictured in the famous frontispiece of Cranmer's Great Bible, attributed to Holbein:

"In this composition the form of God is seen above the kneeling figure of Henry the Eighth, and from the mouth of the Almighty a scroll issues bearing the words, '*I have found me a man after my own heart, who shall fulfil all my will.*' The answer of the Supreme Head is, '*Thy word is a lantern unto my feet.*' Below this compartment the King is seen seated on his throne holding out in each hand a Bible; one of which he is giving to the Bishops with the words, '*Take this and teach*'; the other he presents to Cromwell and a group of lay lords, saying '*I make a decree that in all my kingdom men shall tremble and fear before the living God.*' Underneath these figures the Bishops and doctors are

distributing Bibles to the people, a preacher is preaching, some prisoners are rejoicing even in prison, and the people are shouting 'Vivat Rex.' " ¹

This frontispiece expresses the theory of Establishment which inspired the Canons of 1604, and is set out in Charles I's Declaration which precedes the Thirty-nine Articles in the Prayer Book. It found expression as late as the year 1792, when Burke declared that "in a Christian commonwealth the Church and the State are one and the same thing." ² This identity was legally abandoned at the Revolution, it was no longer assumed by the Apologists of Establishment in the eighteenth century, and it is now maintained by nobody. The alienation of the People from the Church, at first religious, and then political, has gone so far that the term, *National Church*, is becoming stripped of adequate content. Forms can survive their meaning; and names may become a depreciated currency. Not the official action of the established Hierarchy, but the social influence of the spiritual Society, is what we really have in mind when we speak of the Church as the "spiritual organ" of the Nation. We ought, I think, to be careful to recognize the limits within which we may rightly seek the evidences of distinctively Christian influence on human life. It is not reasonable to attribute to Christianity the task of controlling the economic process, or of solving those obstinate racial problems which are the despair of modern statesmen, for Christianity operates within

¹ V. Dixon, *History of the Church of England*, II, 78.

² V. Murray, *The Political Consequences of the Reformation*, p. 247.

the moral sphere, and the determining factors in these spheres are not moral. The Lordship of Jesus Christ in human life must find expression within the strait limits of physical conditions, and how strait those limits are we have perhaps even now not sufficiently realized. Nor may we wisely restrict our attention to the immediate issue as it presents itself to us here in England. That immediate issue is best considered in larger connections. Civilization pursues its course, and Christians are carried along by its advancing tide. The question which confronts us is this, What influence on civilization does the presence of Christians within it really exercise? Dean Church once compared the Christian Religion in Christendom to the Gulf Stream in the Ocean, a salutary and vivifying factor. We may analyse modern civilization until we have identified and separated the elements in it which are properly traceable to Christ's Religion, and we may inquire whether those elements are gaining or losing force. He must be either very ignorant or very prejudiced who does not recognize in modern civilization much, very much, that, if not specifically Christian, is yet so plainly congruous with Christianity as to be inseparable from its sincere profession. We cannot possibly say of Christendom what St. John said of the contemporary pagan society, "*The whole world lieth in the evil one.*" Everywhere civilization is penetrated with the just, compassionate, hopeful, brotherly spirit of Christ's Religion; so deeply penetrated that sometimes the temptation bears powerfully upon us to acknowledge the modern State, rather than the modern Church, as the ordained

Exponent of the Mind of Christ in human Society. But herein we are the victims of a certain confusion of thought. We are tacitly assuming that those Christian elements which allure us are so securely bound into the process of civilization as to be independent of their source. Whereas in truth their presence is contingent on their perpetual renewal at the hands of Christ's Church, in which He carries on His eternal Ministry of individual and social redemption. "*Apart from Me ye can do nothing*" is as true of human society as of the men and women who compose it. The *métier* of the Christian Church within the civilized world is precisely to renew and extend the moral factors which are its strength and the sole guarantees of its permanence. The situation of the Church in our modern world is rapidly coming to reproduce *mutatis mutandis* the situation of the Church in the second century. We may borrow the language of an unknown Christian writer who, about the year A.D. 150, as Bishop Lightfoot thought, wrote "one of the noblest and most impressive of early Christian apologies," known now to students as the "Epistle to Diognetus." He compares Christians in the pagan society of his time to the soul in the body :

"The soul is enclosed in the body, and yet itself holdeth the body together ; so Christians are kept in the world as in a prison-house, and yet they themselves hold the world together."

One great difference between then and now leaps to the student's eyes. That older world, bitterly prejudiced and persecuting as it was, had yet this in common with the Church, that the ground-tones of its thinking were also religious. There was nothing

precisely answering to the naked secularism of de-Christianized Christendom which now confronts us ever more threateningly. This Godless world which repudiates virtue and denies personal responsibility, exalting the Flesh and doing homage to the Machine, carries within itself the seeds of decay and the promise of dissolution. What was true of the ancient persecution will be true of the modern.

“Christianity was proscribed,” writes Sir William Ramsay, “not as a religion, but as interfering with that organization of society which the Empire inculcated and protected.”¹

It is in this secularized and secularist society that the Church has to justify its character as the “salt” and “light” of the world. In order to do this the Church must be free to bear its own witness and live its own life. Only so can it render to mankind its distinctive and incommunicable service. It was so that St. Paul conceived of its rôle in the first century, and it is so that we must conceive of it still in the twentieth. “*Do all things without murmurings and disputings,*” writes the Apostle to the Philippians: “*That ye may be blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation, among whom ye are seen as lights in the world, holding forth the word of life.*”

¹ *V. The Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 372.

THE CHURCH AS THE SPIRITUAL ORGAN OF THE NATION

BY THE RT. HON. LORD HUGH CECIL, P.C., M.P.

WE have heard very interesting and able papers—it seems to me much more interesting and able papers than we are accustomed to at Church Congresses—about the history of the Church. But history is, after all, a collection of epitaphs. It relates to the dead ; and there is always a difficulty in drawing what are sometimes called “the lessons of history.” They too often are merely attempts to guess what a person long dead would have done in circumstances of which he had no idea, and which possibly he would have found difficult to understand. You know how we struggled to conjecture what Bishop Ridley would have thought of the Deposited Book, and how many different opinions there were on this subject. But the Church is alive. It has its great history behind it which counts, but I need not develop what it counts for.

The curious position of the Church of England is that it pretends to be, and it is, a part of the Catholic Church, and yet that it lies in a measure entirely separate from the life of the Catholic Church. The Church is living. It performs, and it is its duty to perform, the function of the Catholic Church in this

country. And the Catholic Church has two aspects—an aspect towards God and an aspect towards man. According to tradition it was represented by the symbol of the moon, and that does indeed in many ways express its true function. It shines with borrowed light ; it expresses to mankind the teaching and the guidance of the Divine Mind, of the mind of the Holy Spirit, which penetrates the Church and teaches the Church how to worship Christ and how to teach the world the things of Christ. It has before all things a life—a life, not only a human life but a divine life. And its function is to worship and to teach. To teach, let us say, first. And for that purpose it is clear that the Church of England must teach something. It cannot be merely the arena in which various theological opinions fight out their quarrel, a sort of tremendous boxing ring kept in a place called Wonderland, or some such name—not a bad name, perhaps, for a Church. Such a function is not sufficient for a Church. It must teach something. Let us remember that once you have said that the Church is a teacher you have also said that in some respects the Church cannot have an open mind, because the teacher can never be open-minded within the limits of what he proposes to teach. Supposing an eminent professor began to instruct you and said “The word *mensa* has for its genitive case either *mensæ* or *mensi*, and it is for discussion which is right. Such a teacher would be unsatisfactory. (Laughter.) So the Church must teach something ; and it is in my view quite clear that as the Bishop of Durham has tersely put it, the Church must be free to determine what it will teach. Neither

Parliament nor any other organ of the State, nor even the general public opinion of the nation, must determine for the Church what its message is to be. It has recently been said that the Church of England must be a Church that gives to the English people what they want. (Laughter.) You may as well say that a ship's doctor must prescribe according to the will of the ship's company. (Laughter.) The Church has essentially to give what it believes to be the Divine Mind to the State, the community and the nation. It must be free. It must be self-confident. It must be sure; it must be really and sincerely trying to give the message which it believes to be the Divine Message. It must not claim infallibility. Here, I may say, I think we are often tripped up by the example of our Roman brethren who have taught the world that if you believe in the Divine Guidance of the Church you must also believe that the Church is infallible. That is a mistake. It is right for the Church to seek and to lean upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit; but the claim that we always find out what that guidance is, and always act upon it quite perfectly, seems to be certainly a delusion. We must lean upon it because it is the light that the Church must reflect upon the world and the State. But, alas! it is only too likely that mistakes may be made.

What we may be sure of is that God will take our affairs into His own hand and if we trust in Him we shall not indeed have the satisfaction of always knowing that we are right, but we shall be led through our difficulties; and those whom we desire to help will be helped, if not strictly in accordance

with our intentions, yet in accordance with the will of God whom we have trusted. And so in regard to teaching : We must frankly and boldly lay down the principles, but we must not seek to apply those principles to certain things and circumstances which are often complicated. The application to certain circumstances is different to the formulation of teaching. It is right to say that all Christians must be friends and show kindness, always kindness, and nothing but kindness one to another. But to apply this and to say that a particular industrial issue or a particular international issue, is to be decided in any particular way implies a knowledge of secular matters which lies often quite beyond the functions of the Church. So in regard to worship. There too the Church must be able freely to propound the true and best mode of worshipping Almighty God in accordance with its belief, and it must have, as in its teachings, certain broad outlines and opinions expressed in its worship. And the worship of the Church ought always to be recognizably the same worship. We talk so much about our difficulties we are apt to exaggerate them. I should claim for the Church of England that though superficially there are very great differences in ritual and in the apparent superficial method of conducting the service, yet essentially it is always manifestly the same service whether you go into a very High church or a very Low church. As I travel about the country I go to different services and see very different sorts of services in our liturgical worship ; but I have never the least doubt that I am worshipping in the Church of England, and that the worship is essentially the same.

And so I think the Church can serve the nation. I have not spoken to you about Establishment. That is a long, a difficult and a rather dull subject. But if Establishment implies anything which is inconsistent with the true spiritual function of the Church, or with the free exercise of that function, then any establishment would be mischievous. It is only a good thing if it means the formal recognition by the State of the spiritual reality of the Church, so that the State does in its corporate capacity perform a religious act and mark itself as a Christian State and community.

But above all things we must have the sense of the Divine Life running through the Church. We must look to the Divine Person who penetrates the Church and guides it. We must look to Him to make straight the path before us, to bring our confusion to His unity, to enlarge our usefulness, to enlighten our eyes so that we may worthily be what, for sure, He means us to be—the light that lightens the State and the nation, set on a candlestick to lead to truth and righteousness and to teach it to glorify God.

THE CHURCH AS THE SPIRITUAL ORGAN OF THE NATION

BY MAJOR J. D. BIRCHALL, M.P.

IT so happens that during the recent controversies on the subject of the Prayer Book I had rather unusual opportunities in the House of Commons, as the secretary of the Committee responsible for the Measure, and in many parts of the country of hearing many diverse opinions. I wish to avoid all history and all theology and all philosophy and to deal with the practical condition of affairs as we find them to-day. I am no Erastian in opinion, but I do attach the very greatest value to the Establishment of the Christian religion in this country. There are many to-day who, perhaps out of despair or for other reasons, instead of attaching the greatest value to the union of Church and State, are demanding disestablishment—to cut the bond, snap the link, tear up the root, and separate that which hitherto had grown together indivisible and inseparable. *Ecclesia Anglicana libera sit* was spoken of a very different Church to what exists to-day. How nice it would be to appoint our own bishops instead of their being appointed by the Prime Minister, who may be of any religion or opinion ! (Some applause.) I am surprised the applause was not warmer !

(Laughter.) If you will look through the list of the last fifty appointments of bishops I think you will probably agree with me that there have not been more than two or three mistakes. (Applause.) The system is illogical, but in practice it works uncommonly well. I doubt myself whether any committee of the Church Assembly or any other electoral body elected from the Church itself would appoint bishops on a smaller margin of mistakes than five per cent. (Applause.) I wonder whether the Church realizes what would happen in this country if the Church were disestablished. May I appeal to this audience at this moment, not so much as Churchmen, but as citizens, because not one of us can escape our responsibilities either as Churchmen or as citizens. No longer would the King be consecrated to his high office and dedicate himself not only to the service of his country but to the service of his God. No longer would the House of Commons open every sitting with an abbreviated form of Evening Prayer with its own chaplain—a service which impresses the very large number of visitors, especially from overseas, from the Dominions and from foreign countries with the importance we attach nationally to a religious service at the opening of our secular debates. No longer would every citizen, as he has to-day, have the right to call upon the service of the Church of England in sickness of body or of soul. No longer would every public function be marked in some way either by grace or by prayer and associated thereby with the deeper and more spiritual things of life. Only those will appreciate the difference who have experienced functions such as took

place in one of our great Dominions a short time ago when a Great War memorial in memory of thousands of soldiers was opened and dedicated by the Mayor. There was not a minister of religion present and not one word of prayer was said thereat. The Church there was disestablished. I venture to think that the State as a living organism does draw from its religious environment in countless ways a kind of sanction or consecration which it can ill afford to lose, especially in these days. I dread with all my heart the danger of the greatest civilized State of the world dissociating itself definitely from the Christian religion. I fear, too, that what I might gain possibly as a Churchman would have to be set off by a greater loss as a citizen.

There are others who, while desiring to retain the Establishment, think it would be possible to have spiritual independence, as it was given to Scotland in 1921. It is an attractive idea; but I venture to think that many of those who advocate that method have forgotten the conditions which exist in Scotland and which are not likely to obtain in this country. I would remind them very briefly of three conditions. (1) In the Scottish Measure the Declaratory Articles of the Church pledged their adherence to the Scottish Reformation. (2) The demand for complete spiritual independence in Scotland was almost universal, which could hardly be said to be true in this country. (3) By far the most important,—Patronage in Scotland rests with the people of the parish. (Applause.) Personally, I do not believe in that system; and I am quite certain that this country would not be willing to abolish

all patronage such as we know it and to allow ministers of religion to be appointed solely by their congregations. It is not likely that we can obtain from Parliament complete spiritual independence on the Scottish model without the conditions which were attached to that independence.

I believe the most important advice, if I can put it in a very humble way, that we can give to our bishops to-day is to go slow and not to be in a hurry. After all, the atmosphere towards the Church is friendly. It was wonderful in the House of Commons to find how friendly it was, especially amongst men who by tradition might have been expected to be hostile. There is no pressing need for the bishops or the Church at once to settle their accounts with the House of Commons. There are bigger things to do, in my opinion. (Applause.) There are many things to do before we enter the lists with the House of Commons. I would mention three :

(1) Our impelling duty to endeavour to dispel the almost universal ignorance which marks Churchmen and others in connection with our history, our position, our claims and our future—ignorance almost beyond imagination. And the danger of ignorance is that catchwords have far more fatal influence than argument. Only recently an inhabitant of Cheltenham wrote to me when asked for a contribution towards Diocesan affairs, and he said : “ I am not going to give a contribution to the Diocese of Gloster because all my money goes to the Diocese of Cheltenham.” (Laughter.) That was from a prominent layman in this town. It is quite true that Cheltenham has now produced a bishop—(applause)—but

the town is not and never will be a see. (Laughter.) We are likely to have the assistance of the Press in our endeavour to enlighten and to educate the country. If only we can eliminate the amount of space that is given to disorderly Darwen or the antics of Avening and concentrate more upon important affairs we should feel more grateful to them even than we are. It is said that M.P.'s show great ignorance of the subjects they are discussing in connection with the Prayer Book. I deny it. But were it true we should be very fit representatives of our constituencies. (Laughter.)

(2) We must endeavour to cultivate a truer sense of proportion in these matters. I am quite sure that many hard-working and thinking laymen are alienated from the work of the Church because they think we spend so much time upon things that don't matter compared with things that do. A man said to me after a recent debate upon the Prayer Book—when I remarked to him, "After all, I should have thought charity and the desire to see the other's point of view was a greater virtue than orthodoxy."—"Do you really mean that?" He did not think so. Well, when we get into a condition of thinking that orthodoxy is more important than charity there is need of a wider vision and for a greater sense of proportion as to things that really matter. The danger, too, about being dogmatic about things that we cannot know and only think or conjecture about is real.

(3) Lastly, the greatest work of all is to bring about by every means in our power closer reunion—closer union in the first place—between members of our

own Church, appealing not to the law to help us, but to loyalty. If only out of our humiliation there can grow a real reunion with the Nonconformist bodies of this country—and I believe in its possibility—then our defeat in the House of Commons will have been a blessing. I plead for a wider knowledge and more tolerant vision and for a closer reunion with other Christian bodies. The Church upon such a foundation would make an appeal to the nation and State which no church under the present condition could hope to make. Its establishment and its liberty would then become a reality. (Applause.)

THE ENGLISH REFORMATION

THE CATHOLIC TRADITION

BY THE REV. CANON T. A. LACEY, D.D., CANON OF
WORCESTER

THE Reformation was a great movement affecting the whole Western Church. Action and reaction were so combined as to make this part of Christendom profoundly different from what it had been before. We do well to remember that this was what the original Reformers intended. The result of their challenge, and of the reply, is a complicated schism, division and subdivision, which seems to be fixed as the inevitable consequence of their first steps. But they foresaw nothing of the kind. They spoke of reforming the Church as a whole. The Lutheran movement was an attempt to work through the Princes on the Empire, and through the Empire on the Papacy. Those who called themselves the Reformed—we had better not fix on them the name of Calvin—dreamt of infusing a new scholastic theology into the existing organization of the Church, and were ready to use that organization as opportunity served ; the new organizations which they invented were makeshifts, and to that extent a confession of failure. When they called themselves the Reformed, however, they were claiming a kind of universality which was not theirs ; Reformation was the watch-word of Trent as much as of Geneva.

There was thus an important element of Catholicity in the Reformation. If I be asked about Catholicism, I shall have to make a distinction. The difference, I think, between the two words is that Catholicity means a temper, and Catholicism means an organized system which that temper has created for its own safeguarding. In the Western Church, Catholicism was the system which had been formed by the working of the episcopate during a thousand years under the leadership of the Roman See, universally acknowledged. It allowed a measure of variation which was always tending to diminish under the constant pressure of the Roman Court and the Pontifical Canon Law. The relation of the central authority to outlying groups was not strictly defined, and on this subject there was a wide range of tolerated opinion between the autocratic curialism of Boniface VIII and the Gallicanism which won a resounding but temporary triumph at the Council of Constance. But the position of the Pope as in some sense chief was beyond question. The Reformers did not begin by disputing it. Luther was borne on the full tide of his reforming zeal for some years before he reached that point, and shortly before his death, in the preface to his collected works, he declared that he had begun by counting with assurance on the support of the Holy See. He appealed to the Pope from the judgment pronounced against him in Germany by the Legate, Cardinal Caietan ; then, in familiar terms, "from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope better informed," and finally on Gallican principles to a General Council. The progress was rapid, but so far within the limits of recognized Catholicism. He after-

wards lapsed into the particularism which his immediate followers erected into a system built on the political configuration of Germany. The ostensibly more radical Reformers, the Swiss and the Genevan, with their followers elsewhere, retained their universal outlook, and did not until much later develop a regional or national separatism corresponding with that of the Lutherans.

We should frankly acknowledge that England contributed little or nothing to the general movement. Our Reformation was almost entirely derived from that of the Continent. It is now clear that Wickliffite Lollardry was extinct before it began, and indeed Wickliff had little influence anywhere except in Bohemia; anything in the main movement derived from him came through the Hussites. In so far as the English Reformation can be said to have begun during the reign of Henry VIII, the driving force was Lutheranism as developed under Princely control. It is known that Cranmer was subject to this influence early in his career, prudently hiding its effect; Tyndal and Firth abandoned themselves openly to it. We can hardly doubt that Henry himself was attracted by the political side of it, though his dallying with the Schmalkaldic League was determined only by his need of allies against Charles V; but he and his more congenial advisers, such as Stephen Gardiner, looked chiefly to the imperialist opponents of the Papacy in the fourteenth century and to the Conciliar movement which was the outcome of their teaching. It is significant that he procured an English translation of the *Defensor Pacis* of Marsiglio of Padua, the purport of which was to subject the Church in

all external aspects to the Civil Authority. His scheme of things was but an extremely combative form of Gallicanism, not much more combative, except in detail, than that of Lewis XIV or that of Joseph II two or three centuries later. But Gallianism, however combative, is not what is understood in history as the Reformation.

The English Reformation really began when Cranmer, with a small minority of the Bishops, used the power of the Council in the name of Edward VI to make radical changes in doctrine and worship. These were premature and came to nothing, having no force behind them except the arbitrary power of the Crown and some great nobles. The experiment lasted barely five years, and the reaction under Mary was thoroughly popular. This again lasted little more than five years, and was followed by another rapid change. The events of the first six months of the reign of Elizabeth are almost inexplicable. It is needless to dwell on the familiar story. The anti-papal legislation of Henry VIII was almost completely revived. The Convocations of the Clergy, weakened by a great pestilence which carried off the Archbishop of Canterbury and more than a half of the other Bishops, protested in vain, and with two exceptions the remaining Bishops were forcibly removed from their sees for refusing an oath of conformity demanded of them. Some of these were men who had gone all lengths with Henry and Cranmer twenty years earlier. But there was now an important change in the circumstances. The Lutheran influence which had been more or less active on the former occasion was passed away,

never again to find much scope in England. During his later years Cranmer had been moving rapidly in the direction of the Helvetic Reformers, and the exiles of Mary's time who flocked back to England and obtained most of the vacant bishoprics were of the same inclination. Yet the framework of medieval Catholicism remained intact, with many of its worst characteristics, seen chiefly in the working of the ecclesiastical courts. The Queen, whose motives need not be considered for our present purpose, was determined to have it so, and was resolved to make room for as many as possible of those who clung to that Catholicism. That she succeeded in part is proved by the fact that the majority of the clergy patiently endured the doctrinal and liturgical changes introduced. It is shown further by the growing opposition of the Puritans, who demanded a complete reformation of the Helvetic or Genevan model.

The power of the Crown in matters of religion, inexplicable to minds of our day, is visible in all these changes. What was built by the working of that power weathered violent storms in the course of the next hundred years, surviving the decay of the power itself. The work was based on the Catholic order of the Church, though with complete disregard of the Papacy, and Catholicism stands in that order, not in particular details of religious practice. In consequence, the Church of England, even when ranking as one of the large group of Reformed Churches, specifically so-called, has always retained the solid form of Catholicism. Nor is this a dead form, a mere relic of the past; it has been kept alive by a constant appeal, not always well-informed, but

seriously meant, to the traditions of Catholic Christendom, as setting a standard to which we should generally conform. You may read that very plainly stated in the Preface to the Book of Common Prayer. You may read it more laboriously in almost all the writings of the great English theologians, from Jewel and Hooker to those of to-day, whom it would be invidious to mention. It is not in obscure corners that the Church of England is Catholic, but in its most public testimony.

THE APPEAL TO SCRIPTURE AND THE PURITAN MOVEMENT

BY THE REV. CANON J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., CANON OF
ST. PAUL'S

THE sixth article of the Church of England declares that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation." The appeal to Scripture was not made in order to substantiate any part of that Nicene Faith, which was common ground among all but extravagant sectaries in the age of the Reformation. If we would determine what it involved, we must inquire how it was applied in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, not to the fundamental doctrines of the Catholic religion, but to the issues dividing Protestant and Papist, Prelatist and Puritan.

But, if particular in application, in principle the appeal is universal. It is essentially coeval with Christianity. If in the pastoral epistle it is the Church which is described as the pillar and ground of the truth, St. Paul had already declared in the epistle to the Galatians that within the Church itself the seat of authority is the Gospel. "If I or an angel from heaven proclaim unto you any other (or different) gospel, let him be anathema." It would have been well if the phrase he here uses for the first time had never become a formula of ecclesiastical

practice. Its impressiveness would not have been impaired.

Irenaeus in the second century transfers the language of Timothy to the Scriptures, when he calls them the *fundamentum et columna fidei*. Augustine, in the fifth, does the same by St. Paul's words about the Gospel in Galatians. Both are justified by the history of the canon itself. Virtually settled before the end of the second century and actually closed by the end of the fourth, the criterion by which the New Testament was distinguished from other ecclesiastical writings was apostolicity. The Church is the pillar and ground of Christian truth because it is the witness and keeper of the Christian Gospel.

Nevertheless, the Reformation did, in fact, accord to the Scriptures a place they had never before occupied in the history of the Church. They were not, and in the nature of the case could not have been, formally recognized in the early ages as a documentary basis of the faith and life of the believing fellowship. Heresy, as it arose, was met by comparison with the inherited belief of the community. With regard to the matters in dispute, general councils became for the time, and indeed it may be said, though not without important qualifications, for all time, an end of controversy. In the West the conversion of the northern nations, better fitted to obey than to understand, combined with the instinct of Rome for rule and discipline to make the teaching Church the supreme authority. But in bringing the people to the Church the task was materially lightened by what is sometimes called bringing the Church to the people. The Holy See has ever been tolerant of

external influences, provided that its central authority remains undisputed. Popular cults, customs, and beliefs united with the products of normal and natural development to produce that amalgam of faith and practice which in the Middle Ages was generally accepted as one with the Christianity of the apostles and prophets. The task of the Schoolmen was to co-ordinate not only the religious fabric, but the whole realm of knowledge, by bringing it to cohere in a unified and rational system of thought.

The work of the New Learning was not to challenge the consistency with itself of the imposing structure thus reared, but to restore "the communion of the mind with nature"; in other words, to build afresh upon the living rock of reality, to substitute observation and experiment for reasoning and dialectic. With the birth of the historical and scientific method the Reformation gave the Bible back to the Church as the standard of criticism in matters of faith. Not that the canonical Scriptures had ever been set aside or even publicly ignored. Geoffrey Chaucer knew the Bible a great deal better than the majority of modern Englishmen. There are about a hundred references to it in the Parson's Tale, and seven or eight even in the Pardoner's. But it became everyman's book. That is what is meant by an open Bible. It was made as accessible to all as the book of nature itself.

What the Church of England did for the first time in the sixteenth century was to make the Scriptures its primary standard, thereby relegating all other documents and definitions to a secondary position as what among the Presbyterians would be called

subordinate standards. To describe this action as substituting private judgment for authority is not strictly accurate. The right of the individual to be free was never confused with the duty of the community to be something. The Christianity of Creeds and Councils was not questioned. But, inasmuch as the facts recorded in Scripture are the reality on which the Church's life depends, and definitions, however exactly drawn, can never be more than representations of that reality, it was laid down that "things ordained," even by the most perfect instrument for eliciting the mind of the Church conceivable, "have neither strength nor authority unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture."

But who or what is to decide the validity of this declaration when given? The answer is that history will in the long run decide. Here we have the guarantee that with the appeal to Scripture the ultimate authority has been reached. In every department of human inquiry the final ground of assurance is facts. "Things are what they are, and their consequences will be what they will be." To put the Scriptures behind all constitutional authority is simply to appeal from the inaccuracy of human knowledge to the certainty of divine truth, to regard no controversy as closed while the patient and laborious study of the original sources may reveal flaws in the language of the most exact definitions or inaccuracy in the perceptions on which they rest. The facts are there.

It is indeed a revolution in method, bringing the teaching of the Church into living touch not only

with apostolic Christianity, but also, and at the same time, with the modern mind, that is represented by the place which the Bible occupies in the system of the English Church. What was wrong, Bacon is never tired of telling us, in the quasi-scientific method of mediaevalism was the authority of great names coupled with the *intellectus sibi permissus*, the process of ratiocination unchecked by facts and concealing unproved assumptions. This is precisely the defect which vitiated the splendid edifice of scholastic divinity. It paid too high a reverence to great names. A theory was not necessarily true because Augustine or Cyprian or Ignatius had held it. The subtle sliding of inferential theology too often concealed assumptions which had no basis, either directly or by consequent, in the Gospel. Anglican teaching, by working upon Scripture, may be deficient in system as compared with the mediaeval theology, but it combined a learning not less weighty with a constant reference to the facts of the Christian revelation. In making its appeal to Scripture it adopted the inductive method.

I had intended to illustrate this, had time allowed, by its application to the two main issues which divided the Reformation from the Latin Church: the theory of the Eucharist and the doctrine of Purgatory. Compelled to choose, I select that which, to use the picturesque phrase of Hooker, was "the postern gate" by which "cometh in the whole mart of papal indulgences."

There is a very interesting fragment of Hooker, preserved in the Dublin manuscript and reprinted in the Oxford edition as Sermon 3, which forcibly

illustrates the rejection of the mediaeval method. The topic with which it is dealing, at the point where it abruptly breaks off, is Purgatory. The Romish system, he says, is built up and cemented into a series of propositions that appear to hold together in an orderly process of reasoned development, but which are not only not consequent upon those common Christian beliefs which are first alleged as the "solemn entrance" to this process of ratiocination, but are rather repugnant to them. The truth, which is "of all Christian comfort the root, is that the death of our Lord and Saviour hath duly and sufficiently paid for the sins of all the world by that abundant price of redemption upon the cross." To this is added what again he asserts cannot reasonably be denied by "all men Christian," namely, "that no man was ever partaker of this benefit but in the knot and unity of his body mystical, which is the Church."

These two positions are involved in the primary Christian facts, or, in other words, grounded "upon most certain warrant of Holy Scripture." But here, according to Hooker, begins that process of reasoning whereby the mediaevalists, "having now full possession of their hearers' minds, slip into that, which, being in truth utterly repugnant unto the verdicts hitherto given, they notwithstanding adjoin as consonant and agreeable thereunto." The conclusion that there are debts which the penitent children of God must discharge beyond the limits of mortal life comes to be regarded as of equal value for the faith and practice of Christians with the primary truth of the forgiveness of sins. As Hooker states what he

calls the Romish doctrine, it is not confined to what are technically known as "purgatory pains," a teaching which, like the Tridentine definition of transubstantiation, may easily be renounced without touching the real point at issue in the Reformation. "The lack of the abundant fruition of the majesty of God," as ascribed to the faithful departed, was the ultimate ground upon which mediaeval practice rested. To base Christian practice upon "the want of perfect felicity and bliss" in the departed, or any other foundation not supplied by the facts of revelation or the *data* of the Christian religion themselves, was, in the opinion of our great Doctor, to follow the method of the mediaeval mind, not that which had been recovered in a form applicable to the needs of the modern world by Erasmus and Luther.

How Hooker would have proceeded to develop his argument we can only conjecture, because at this point the fragment stops. But in one of the next group of Anglican Fathers there is an interesting passage which shows the seventeenth century following in relation to this very subject precisely the method which was laid down for the English Church in the sixteenth. No better commentary on the Prayer Book of 1662 could be found than the writings of Bishop Pearson. In his famous classic, the *Exposition of the Apostles' Creed*, he asks what, if any, practical inferences are to be drawn from the place occupied by the departed in the Communion of Saints. With the conclusions at which he arrives, which may or may not be valid, I am not concerned. It is to his method, which stands in marked contrast with that of mediaevalism, that I desire to draw

attention. "That we communicate with" the faithful departed, says Pearson, "in hope of that happiness which they actually enjoy is evident; that we have the Spirit of God given us as earnest, and so a part of their felicity, is certain. But what they do in heaven in relation to us on earth, or what we ought to perform in relation to them in heaven, beside a reverential respect and study of imitation, *is not revealed unto us in the Scriptures, nor can be concluded by necessary deduction from any principles of Christianity.*"

The appeal to Scripture, then, is the inductive method applied to Christianity, the field of the Word being to Christian teaching what the field of Nature is to physical science. Early patristic literature is a highly important commentary on Scripture, and in this, writers like Bishop Bull perceived its supreme significance. I would repeat here what I wrote twenty-seven years ago in a pamphlet called *The Thing Signified*, which, as I am not infrequently assured, still receives greater consideration than, in my judgment, it deserves, but the main conclusions of which I have found no reason to modify. "The English Church," I then said, and I would repeat it no less emphatically to-day, "claims to rest upon the rock of the Bible, and the Bible only, as exclusively as any body of Protestants in Christendom. The only difference is that, in consequence partly of their profound learning, partly of a national fidelity to facts, our English theologians have ever given their true interpretative value alike to ancient and modern divines, and have thus been able to form a truer and more reasonable estimate of the facts of the apostolic

witness than the bolder and less cautious writers of other communions have generally reached." I am not here offering any opinion concerning the relative value of the Anglican contribution to contemporary theology. With regard to the past, I think it will be generally conceded by those acquainted at first hand with the Elizabethan and Caroline divines.

How the Anglican appeal to Scripture differed from the use made of it by the Puritans no reader of the *Ecclesiastical Polity* can well mistake. Our responsible teachers have always regarded it as *sources* in respect to what is essentially Christian, not as an infallible directory in matters of religious doctrine and practice, to say nothing of ethical and social problems. The tendency of Puritan societies, and of the more distinctly Puritan section of the Church of England itself, has, to put the case no higher, always been to accept the second alternative, and in consequence to be no truer to history than the papal opponents of Jewel or Laud. It is only as they have outgrown their Puritanism that they have become historical; where, that is, they have not rather developed in the direction of Latitudinarianism and philosophy.

If the Papacy exalted ecclesiastical tradition to a place it ought never to have occupied, the Puritans rejected it where it ought to have been followed. The Genevans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries in the first instance used the Scripture as a directory of public worship. They claimed also to find in its pages the model of church polity. It is noteworthy that these are the two instances, and indeed the only instances, in which the Church of

England in its formularies appeals to patristic authority, in the one case as independent, in the other as supplementing the witness of Scripture. In the second preface of the Prayer Book *Concerning the Service of the Church* reference is made to the "godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers." This arises out of the broad principle that the order and arrangement of public worship belong to those things that "have had their beginning by the institution of man," so that here the Fathers not only command high respect as revealing the principles upon which Christian institutions have been framed, but also establish the long continuance of customs which ought only to be changed in so far as they no longer minister to edification. The other instance is to be found in the preface to the Ordinal, where it is asserted that "it is evident unto all men diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient authors that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." Here it will be observed that it is an historical fact to which the Fathers are called to bear witness, and that a fact which could not be established without them because it carries us beyond the range of the New Testament. Both these instances illustrate the difference between the Anglican and the Puritan appeal to Scripture, and this is more particularly true of the second. No intelligent Presbyterian to-day supposes that the highly articulated Genevan model is to be found in Scripture, while the careful statement of the Ordinal still stands, and, if only we Anglicans are scrupulously true to the limitations of our position and recognize

how to adapt it to the evolving conditions of the Church, is destined to play an important part in the solution of the problem of Christain reunion.

Beyond the sphere of ecclesiastical practice, to which the appeal to Scripture is only applicable where custom or usage is alleged to be contrary to it, and that only to prove a negative, Puritanism was equally unsuccessful in the severity with which it demanded a Biblical basis for all moral and religious truth. The Bible is not the Koran. Teachers of the Church of England, while they have insisted that it is the sole source of the truth as it is in Jesus, that is, of the Gospel of our Lord and Saviour, have never regarded it as containing the whole truth of religion. "Albeit," says the wise Hooker, "Scripture do profess to contain in it all things that are necessary unto salvation, yet the meaning cannot be simply of all things which are necessary, but all things that are necessary in some certain kind or form; as all things that are necessary, and either could not at all or could not easily be known by the light of natural discourse." It is not without significance that a typically English thinker, Joseph Butler, released himself from the bonds of that Presbyterianism, in which, like other distinguished Anglicans, he was educated, before he gave his mind to the production of the *Analogy of Religion*. That "candle of the Lord," which he called conscience, was something different from the fire kindled by Latimer and Ridley, and was not lit in the first instance from the Scriptures. The intelligence of Geneva was too rigid to allow room for that freedom and play of thought which are alone consistent with Truth.

The Puritan tended to make his appeal to Scripture in such a way as even to leave unanswered the fundamental question why certain books and no other were to be held sacred, and to provoke, not without reason, the retort that what he really held to be inspired was his own opinion. He was like Pythagoreans and Platonists stamping their conceits on nature. If the Church of England appealed to Scripture and to Scripture only, it was never in such a sense as not to make the phrase "to Scripture and Right Reason" a fuller exposition of the truth. Its appeal is to Scripture reasonably interpreted. If reason is not the same thing as common sense, common sense is three parts of it, and the rest is historical instinct and a recognition of the limits which attach even to the most unqualified statements; in other words, a sense of proportion. Nowhere is the remarkable difference of quality between the English doctors and Puritan, or for that matter, papal, controversialists more conspicuously apparent than in the use they make of the citations by which their positions are supported. There is a justice, a reasonableness, a sobriety in the interpretations of a Jewel or a Hooker which carries the suggestion that, unlike his opponent, he is not supporting a *parti pris*, but has arrived at his results because the facts demand it. I do not think it is mere prejudice which creates the impression that Jewel and Hooker are usually right, their antagonists usually wrong. This applies to the handling of the Fathers no less than of the Scriptures themselves. The employment of both is common to all the controversialists of the time, but the Anglicans

manage to make the reader feel that their conclusions are present in the text, as the others do not.

This is a direct consequence of their method. They use their authorities primarily as sources, and, though critical science has vastly improved since the sixteenth century, its spirit has never been absent from genuine Anglican theology. Even in Elizabethan times the existence of translations of the Bible was explicitly recognized as demanding caution and discrimination in the treatment of it, and this is only a step to that use of the historical method in handling the ascertained text itself which invests it with yet greater accuracy and precision. No doubt this Anglican temper, which protected English Christianity from the shifting vagaries of sectaries, has had the defect of its quality. The great calamity of English Christianity in the eighteenth century was the failure of Butler and Wesley to understand one another. To assert that the appeal to Scripture cannot be made without sound learning is one thing. To despise as undisciplined enthusiasm the spiritual experience of cobblers and such-like trash, as a bishop once called them, is quite another. None the less, it remains true that it was the English Church that recognized by what almost looks like a power of intuitive perception the true values of the appeal to Scripture as, on the one hand, the criticism of tradition and dogma, and on the other the safeguard of progress and development.

Christianity rests neither upon the dogmas of an institution nor upon religious experience. Dogma is representation, not reality, and there must always

be an appeal from the representative forms to the reality itself. This is inherent in the very nature of dogma. It can never be the living Word. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." His Person and Work give to the Scriptures their unity and coherence. Religious experience can only become Christian experience if it rests upon the Gospel. From this point of view it will be not spiritual progress, but spiritual evaporation, unless it remains in contact with Christian reality as it is for ever expressed in the facts of the Gospel. Both these tendencies, to uncriticized dogma and to unchecked experience, are very apparent in English religion at the present time. It is not uncommon to think of them as dividing the field. But both are in fact sub-Christian. Looked at from the point of view of the opposite side, the Catholic is unreal, the Modernist invertebrate. What is needed to give life to the one, backbone to the other and virility to both is a sound, intelligent, and whole-hearted appeal to Scripture.

ERASMUS AND THE APPEAL TO SOUND LEARNING

BY THE REV. L. ELLIOTT BINNS, D.D.

OUR English Reformation, as Bishop Collins used to remind us, was not "made in Germany." None the less, we shall fail to understand it aright if we do not recognize that its underlying causes were in many ways similar to those which produced the contemporary upheaval on the Continent. Here as in Germany the desire was supreme for freedom from Roman interference and freedom from Roman rapacity. This desire was no new thing; but by the beginning of the sixteenth century it had become so compelling that no considerations, either of sentiment or of interest, could any longer stand in its way. The Teutonic race was determined at every cost to secure itself against Latin exploitation. In this resolve I think that we have the effective cause of the Reformation. In support of the theory, I would remind you of the very significant fact that when at last the dividing-line between Protestant and Papist (to use the correct terms, since both claimed to be Catholic) found final stability it followed almost exactly the frontier of the old Empire. The Church of Rome retained the allegiance only of those races which had been imbued with the civilization of its pagan predecessor.

In suggesting that racial differences were the predominant cause of the breach in the Church I do not wish to underrate the importance of other factors. There was much dissatisfaction in the minds of many with both the practices and the doctrines of the Church : but these alone would never have generated sufficient power to breach the massive walls behind which ancient abuses and corruptions were sheltering themselves.

I want to make this difference in attitude in matters of religion between the Northern and Southern peoples quite clear, because a similar difference is also to be traced in their attitude towards culture as it found expression in the Renaissance. In Italy the New Learning was mainly a revived paganism, and the eyes of the Humanists were so dazzled by the newly discovered glories of the visible world around them that they forgot the eternal splendours of the world invisible. Christianity in the eyes of many of them only became respectable when forced into the mould of classical and pagan forms of expression. The Northern Renaissance was a purer, sterner movement, and it endeavoured to combine a revived interest in letters with the pursuit of a lofty moral ideal. By its passage of the Alps the movement may have lost some of the languid sweetness which marked it in the land of its origin, but it certainly gained a new vigour and a new purity.¹ Of this Northern Renaissance Erasmus was the highest product.

In some quarters it has been the fashion to regard Erasmus as a mere dilettante both in learning and in

¹ The above paragraph is based on my Hulsean Lectures, *Erasmus the Reformer*, pp. 6, 81.

religion. Although such an attitude goes back to his own contemporaries, I do not think that it can justly be maintained. Erasmus's extraordinary capacity for discerning the humorous side of serious matters, his lightness of touch, his charm both of style and of manner—these characteristics were apt to deceive those who did not trouble to look below the surface into regarding him as superficial, and even as sceptical. His life's history surely gives the lie to all such hasty judgments.

When little more than a boy Erasmus had determined to devote himself to learning, and to learning not merely for its own sake but as a corrective of the abuses of his times. "Give light," he once wrote, "and the darkness will disappear of itself."¹ History shows that he seriously underrated the powers of superstition and ignorance against which he had to wage war; but his undue optimism is a sufficient measure of his entire sincerity. About the time of his first visit to England we find him declaring that no desire for temporal fame had inspired his intense labours to acquire a mastery of letters, but the holy ambition of cleansing the Temple of the Lord from barbarous ignorance. Further testimony comes from another letter, in which he asks to be informed of the arrival of any fresh Greek manuscript: "I would rather pledge my coat than not get it," he writes, "particularly if it be a religious book." I would have you mark that last phrase, because I feel that

¹ Cf. the dying request of Goethe for "Mehr Licht." Although this cry was for physical light, it represented his mental attitude all through life. The words were not the last actually uttered by him: see Ludwig, *Goethe*, ii, p. 650.

it gives a very significant clue to Erasmus's real attitude. We may allow ourselves to question the literal truth of his assurance to Colet that a desire to know the mind of St. Paul was the motive of his setting out to learn Greek, but there can be but little doubt that in the application of sound learning to the religious problems of the day Erasmus perceived his own high vocation, and that from first to last this was the main inspiration of his life. Having established, as I hope I have done, Erasmus's real devotion to sound learning, we will now come to consider the part which he played in the English Reformation.

All through its long history the Church of England has had a reputation for producing learned men. We have but to think of Bede and Alcuin, of John of Salisbury and Roger Bacon (to name but a few), to realize the greatness of our tradition. In the days immediately before the Reformation, in England as elsewhere, the standard of learning amongst Churchmen had grievously fallen. This was largely due to the perverse lengths to which the predominant school of thought, Scholasticism, had carried its investigations. Even in the thirteenth century St. Thomas Aquinas, in professing to give a brief and simple exposition of the Christian Faith in such a way that a beginner could understand it, found that he required more than two million words, the size of some dozen novels, in which to do it. By the time of Erasmus things had become infinitely worse. Upon every subject the Schoolmen professed to have knowledge, and they could describe even the infernal regions "as if they had already lived there for some years." (You will recognize here the ironical pen of Erasmus

himself.) He complains that they had taken theology, the queen of the sciences, and stripping her of all her beauty and dignity, had reduced her to the state of a naked beggar. Their speculations were exceedingly subtle, none could deny that, but they were "crude and barren . . . with no sap in them, nor any breath of life." Men preferred "to kiss the old shoes and dirty handkerchiefs of the saints" to studying their writings; and indeed to be ignorant, especially of Greek, was held to be the mark of orthodoxy.

The depth of clerical ignorance was appalling. The common people, and even many of their betters, regarded the priest as a sort of "magician," and so long as he could perform the miracle of the Mass asked for little more. Perhaps some idea of the state of things can best be gained by taking the result of the visitation of this diocese by Bishop Hooper in 1551. The clergy, who numbered 311, were asked a few simple questions: they had to give the number of the Commandments, and then to repeat them; the Articles of Faith; and finally to say the Lord's Prayer and to state where it came from. Only thirty-two, just over ten per cent, could meet this test in a really satisfactory way; nineteen others gave some kind of answer to all the questions; none of the rest could reply to them all, and eight were actually found who could answer nothing, not knowing even the Lord's Prayer nor the number of the Commandments!

Erasmus lived in that delightful age when scholars, no matter of what country, formed a single commonwealth and spoke a single tongue. The roll of his intimates makes a long and impressive list, and the Englishmen upon it are not the least worthy of their

place. We find men like Linacre and Grocin, pioneers of Greek and other studies in this land ; Fisher, Bishop of Rochester (the chief of the Erasmians in England according to Lord Acton) ;¹ Warham, the Primate ; the beloved Colet, and the brilliant genius of Thomas More. With Tunstall, too, and Pace, men of importance in their day, he was on terms of no small friendship. It may be also that in the years spent in Cambridge he exerted influence upon Cranmer through personal intercourse, though there is no record that the future archbishop ever attended his lectures. None the less, there is surely significance in the statement of Cranmer that in 1511, the very year in which Erasmus took up residence in Cambridge, his mind began to turn from the medieval Schoolmen to "Faber, Erasmus, and good Latin authors." The reputation of Erasmus as a writer perhaps led him to study his works, as it led a younger contemporary, Thomas Bilney, who confesses that allured by his fame as an author, he read his setting forth of the New Testament and so, as he puts it in his paradoxical way, "at last heard speak of Jesus." It was to the influence of Bilney that the reforming movement in England owed the adhesion of Hugh Latimer.

This land of ours aroused in Erasmus a rare affection, and more than once he expressed the intention of ending his days here. The admiration which he felt for the noble group of English Humanists was also profound. Their learning seemed to him to be

¹ *Historical Essays and Studies*, p. 18. Lord Acton considered that the best portion of the English Church in the early sixteenth century consisted of the followers of Erasmus.

both deeper and wider than that of the more showy Italians, whom, even before his disappointing trip to Italy, he condemned as shallow. In a letter to Pace he goes so far as to speak of England as "the abode and stronghold of both virtue and knowledge."

That Erasmus owed much to his English friends cannot be denied. His debt to Colet, in particular was considerable, though I think that Seeböhm exaggerates it. From him he learned to look upon the search for truth not merely as an exercise of the intellect, as an opportunity for the display of verbal dexterity, but as a deep passion of the soul. On the other hand, the constant expressions of these same friends testify to the influence which he exerted upon them, and so upon their country. Perhaps the most striking and interesting tribute is to be found in the letter sent by Henry VIII on his accession, inviting Erasmus to return to England and be his fellow-worker in the promotion of learning and purity. As is well known, the lofty ideals of the young king were soon tarnished amidst the intrigues of the times, and the stay of Erasmus, who eagerly responded to the invitation, brought him little but disappointment. None the less, the letter itself is important evidence of Erasmus's reputation in England.

Erasmus paid his first considerable visit to this country in 1499 when he came over at the suggestion of his old pupil, Lord Mountjoy. It was on this visit that he spent a few weeks at Oxford; his only visit, so far as we know, as the little group of scholars whom he met there, for one reason or another, soon afterwards migrated to London. The oft-quoted saying of Knight, that Erasmus learned Greek at

Oxford and taught it at Cambridge, rests, I am afraid, on a mistaken conjecture as to the dates of some of Erasmus's letters, as can be seen by consulting Dr. Allen's edition.¹ Thus an Oxford scholar comes in after two hundred years to rob his own university of a distinction which was mistakenly given to it by a Cambridge scholar. Gibbon, by the way, although but an indifferent Oxonian, as is well known, evidently prized this tribute.²

The Reformation Movement as a whole owed much to the work which Erasmus did on the New Testament, and England not least. It was part of his declared policy as an advocate of sound learning to send men back to original authorities. So the New Testament was to be read in Greek, not in the Vulgate, which was apt to be misleading. Much of the preparatory work on his great undertaking of bringing out an edition of the Greek New Testament was done during the years in which Erasmus was resident in Cambridge; and although the edition when finally produced was very imperfect, as a pioneer work it is worthy of the highest praise. The statement is often made that the accuracy of the work was sacrificed to speed, in order that it might be published before the Great Bible which was being produced under the direction of Cardinal Ximenes. It is, of course, quite possible that the printers of Basle wished to anticipate their more leisurely brethren at Alcalá,

¹ P. S. Allen, *Erasmi Epistolae*, i, p. 241.

² "Although a stout academical patriot, he (Dr. Knight) is forced to acknowledge that Erasmus learned Greek at Oxford and taught it at Cambridge." *Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, lxvi, n. 117.

but so far as I know there is no definite evidence of any rivalry. In Cambridge, where as we have seen the work had mainly been done, the Greek Testament was eagerly welcomed ; and the Cambridge men whom Wolsey had imported into Oxford to help on his new college soon spread its influence there also.

But Erasmus did not wish the knowledge of the Scriptures to become the property of scholars only, but of all men. "I wish," he once wrote, "that even the weakest woman should read the Gospels, should read the Epistles of Paul ; and I wish that they were translated into all languages, so that they might be read and understood, not only by Scots and Irishmen, but also by Turks and Saracens. I long that the husbandman should sing portions of them to himself as he follows the plough, that the weaver should hum them to the tune of his shuttle, that the traveller should beguile with their stories the tedium of his journey." A similar sentiment was expressed, you will remember, by Tindale, upon whom, as upon Coverdale, Erasmus exercised great influence.¹

All this was by way of preparation, for by the time that the Reformation actually came to a head Erasmus was already an old man, and his sympathies were by no means with Luther and his friends. The Continental Reformation was too violent and revolutionary, too little aware of the claims of sound learning, to suit his ideas. As the movement gathered force it became less and less pleasing to him, and his earlier suspicions and disquiet were all too surely confirmed.

Here things were better done, and I cannot help thinking that had he lived to see it Erasmus would

¹ See Westcott, *The History of the English Bible*, pp. 179, 257.

have approved our English Reformation especially in its later, Caroline, stages. The description of its aims and ideals given by our president in his Bampton Lectures is entirely in accordance with his mind. "The ideal of many of our reformers," writes Dr. Headlam, "had been the transformation of our institutions by an appeal to reason and history rather than the assertion of a rigid and narrow dogmatic standpoint. We have avoided any violent break with the past and have been singularly distrustful of a narrow standpoint."¹

The leaders of the English Reformation showed quite clearly their desire for an educated clergy, the first sign in any Church of a recognition of the claims of learning. The famous Injunctions of Edward VI, issued in 1547, contained a provision that in every parish church a copy of the *Paraphrases* of Erasmus should be provided, and that such of the clergy as were below the status of B.D. should obtain a copy for their own use. It is interesting to remember that the Princess Mary, soon to be queen, translated part of the Gospel of St. John for this purpose. Later again the Royal Visitation of 1559 renewed the above order, and, in addition, charged the chapters of cathedrals to pay special attention to preaching, lecturing, and study, and moreover to provide a suitable library. The Canons of 1571 go still further and make a really systematic attempt to encourage learning, not only amongst the clergy, but amongst the laity as well. Definite Biblical tasks are enjoined upon the non-graduate clergy, in which at every visitation they are to be examined; and a know-

¹ *The Doctrine of the Church and Reunion*, p. 196.

ledge of the Catechism is demanded from laymen before they can be admitted to communion, become godparents, or even enter into the holy estate of matrimony.

“The formula which most explains the position of the Church of England,” said Bishop Creighton, “is that it rests on an appeal to sound learning.”¹ That this appeal was not neglected amidst the turmoil and confusion of the Reformation was due in large measure to the work of Erasmus in preparing a number of followers who were powerful enough to insist that its voice should be heard.

Of all the various streams of influence which came to affect the Church of England in the Reformation Era, that which had its source in the library of the student has received the least recognition from people in general; but it is the source which has the most vital significance for the age in which we find ourselves. Erasmus still lives on as a pattern and a teacher, although much of his message is now obsolete; and he lives because all that he taught and did was based upon that solid structure of sound learning without which the present is divorced from the past and incapable adequately of facing the future.

¹ *The Church and the Nation*, p. 251.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF ANGLICAN THEOLOGY AFTER THE REFORMATION

BY THE REV. H. MAYNARD SMITH, D.D., CANON OF
GLOUCESTER

I

THE policy of the Tudors and Stuarts may be summed up by saying that they desired one Church co-extensive with the nation. Everbody also wanted to belong to that one Church, but very few were ready to tolerate their neighbours. The duty of private judgement was a shibboleth, but it took long for men to understand that the Church must in consequence be comprehensive. Comprehension, indeed, is a word that implies some limits, and the most comprehensive of Churches must have a standard to which all can rally. What that standard was to be, and how the limits of comprehension should be determined, were the problems of the seventeenth century.

The early Reformers were largely influenced by Lutheran theologians, and that influence is patent in our Prayer Book and Articles. But the Marian exiles took refuge at Geneva, Zurich and Frankfort, because the Lutheran States refused to receive them.

So, Calvinistic theology for nearly a century was to

have great influence, but the attempt to introduce the Genevan Platform failed. Elizabeth would brook no foreign interference, and James I knew only too well that a Presbyter is but a Priest writ large. The very laymen who applauded the Calvinistic preachers had no intention of submitting to Calvinistic discipline ; and the Calvinists who were elevated to the Episcopate soon became so enamoured with Prelacy that they were deaf to the learning of Cartwright, the eloquence of Travers or the billingsgate of the Marprelate Tracts.

Before Elizabeth died, learning was no longer a monopoly of the Calvinists, and England was no longer at the mercy of foreign teachers. Her very Calvinists were an English variety. They were thought to be half Remonstrants at the Synod of Dort.

The country was settling down after the bewildering changes of the Reformation, but those who accepted what had been done were divided into two great parties. The one stressed how much remained of the old order, the other magnified the changes which had been made. The one called itself Protestant, the other was called Puritan.

The Protestants rejoiced in the continuity of the Church, accepted the Catholic Creeds as sufficient symbols of Faith, and emphasized the sacramental system. They stood for freedom of thought and uniformity of worship. They believed in free will, the value of good works and liberty of action.

The Puritans, on the other hand, glorified the Reformation and wished to impose on the Church a rigid system of theology, while they claimed for themselves the right to worship as they pleased. They

stood for the Divine Decrees, derided the value of good works, and issued a multitude of prohibitions to be observed with Pharisaic exactitude.

When the Protestant party became dominant in the Church, the Puritans raised a No Popery cry against the Bishops. The anti-clerical Selden cynically remarked, "We charge the Prelatical clergy with Popery to make them odious, though we know that they are guilty of no such thing." It was a good cry, because the people had but one story-book—Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, and rejoiced in one festival—the day of Guy Fawkes. Not content with this, the Puritans appealed to Scotch Calvinists and English sectaries for help, with a result they had not anticipated. The Church they had wanted to have all to themselves was overthrown and suppressed. For ten long years it was only "a visible Church" in the chapel of Sir Richard Brown at Paris.

After the Restoration, the Protestants, soon to be called High Churchmen, came back. As the result of persecution they were much more stiff, rigid and dogmatic than they had been. They were also convinced that the cause of Church and King was one, and preached in season and out about the divine right of monarchs and the duty of non-resistance.

The Puritans seceded on Black Bartholomew's day rather than accept the new Popish Prayer Book, but for the next forty years the influence of the Latitudinarians was increasing. They did not form a party, for as they spread from one centre, they tended to get further and further from one another.

Some, like Jeremy Taylor, believed in the sacramental life and valued ceremonial. To-day they

would be called Liberal Catholics. Some like the Cambridge Platonists were indifferent to institutional religion. They were intellectual mystics who cultivated the interior life, and extolled reason as "the candle of the Lord." Then there was Joseph Glanvill, who hoped by universal scepticism to drive the world back to Faith. He wrote *The Vanity of Dogmatising*, and maintained that the only proof of religion lay in experience. There was also Archbishop Leighton, an Evangelical born out of due time. He loved our Lord and loved holiness, and cared very little for theological problems. Lastly there were the fashionable preachers who found their audiences tired of controversy. They were not themselves much in touch with the supernatural order, had a contempt for mystical experience and a distaste for dogma. They believed in a moral Governour of the universe and that conduct was at least nine-tenths of religion.

Then came the Revolution, and the leaders of the High Church party were driven out of the Church because they would not break their oaths to the Monarch who had ill-treated them. They went forth—"Martyrs who were not wanted"--to form what the saintly Ken called "a Church of the Cross." Their places were taken by complaisant Latitudinarians who preached sermons of inordinate length in beautifully lucid language on the commonplaces of morality.

II

From this brief review of contending parties it might be assumed that the Church of England stands

for nothing definite ; but to believe this would be a great mistake.

First, the Church of England has never had any doubt about the place she holds in Christendom. As early as 1562 Jewel published his famous *Apology*, in which he insisted on the continuity of the Church of England, and that it remained the Catholic Church in this country. He was emphatic that it was founded on the Holy Scriptures as interpreted by the ancient Fathers, that it professed the Catholic Creeds, accepted the first four œcumenical Councils, maintained the historic ministry, and celebrated the Sacraments as our Lord commanded. His book was translated into English by the learned mother of Francis Bacon, and it was ordered by Convocation to be placed in all parish churches. It became in consequence almost official. Moreover, the same claims are reiterated—in 1606 by Dr. Field, the great Dean of Gloucester ; in 1622 by the Low-Church Bishop, Joseph Hall ; in 1654, by the High-Church Archbishop, Bramhall ; and in 1671 by Bishop Bull, a man of unquestioned learning and moderation.

Secondly, the Church of England has always appealed to history and never been afraid of facing facts. The theories of Rome and Geneva were both tested in this way. The cry was “ Back to the Primitive Church,” and the obscurity of that period caused most of the dissensions. Of course, the idea of the Church held by these divines, was much too static and their appeal to history far too limited. They were antiquaries seeking for precedents rather than historians trying to understand the movements of the past. They could no more return to the Primitive

Church than we can go back to the Reformation. Whitgift was the first who perceived this, Hooker acknowledged it, but Laud seems to have had a true vision of the value of history. He wrote : " Tradition is but a lane in the Church : it hath an end not only to receive us in, but another after to let us out into more open and richer ground." As I read these words, I wondered what he would have said to Newman's *Essay on Development*. At any rate, he had some conception of progress, although he knew that progress does not come by revolution, but grows out of the past.

Thirdly, the Church of England has always believed in free enquiry. It is sometimes said that she has no systematic theology. It is true—but Englishmen have refused to submit to a theological system just as they have refused to be bound by a legal code. They were not impressed by the logical consistency of Calvinism, or by the more imposing structures of Bellarmine and Suarez, because they have always been impatient and a little suspicious of formal logic. It is the glory of Hooker that he did for theology what Bacon was to do for physical science. He opened the way for enquiry and the inductive method.

For Hooker, God was the Supreme Reason, the world was rationally ordered, and there was a reign of law. But God's law was imperfectly known—in part it was revealed, in part it could only be ascertained by enquiry. A great distinction is drawn between laws which exist as the reason of things and laws which are imposed in accordance with circumstances. All positive laws are for Hooker mutable, while all human formulation of law must be provisional. It is only by an act of faith he can

say of Law, "its seat is the bosom of God and its voice the harmony of the World," for if his teaching be correct we shall only be perfectly in tune when we are at one with God and the last fact is known. Hooker was a great student of St. Thomas Aquinas, but only an Angelic Doctor from heaven could have composed a Summa in accordance with his principles.

Laud is equally clear on the right of enquiry. He is certain that the mysteries of the Faith are not contradictory to reason, and that the end for which God had bestowed this great gift was that men might discover His ways.

Chillingworth is scornfully emphatic about the man who takes anything on trust and doubts if God will accept what he calls "the sacrifice of fools."

Jeremy Taylor in his *Liberty of Prophesying* shows that neither in the Bible, the Fathers, the Councils, nor the Popes, can be found an infallible voice which will excuse a man from enquiring and judging for himself.

It was in consequence of this insistence on free enquiry that English Churchmen faced Cartesianism without dismay, and that theologians were prominent in founding and supporting the Royal Society. Men like Wilkins and Wallis, Ray, Barrow and Pell, would add renown to any society, however illustrious. The English Divines of the seventeenth century are not responsible for the conflict between the scientific and religious views of the world.

In emphasizing the fact that all parties stood for reasonable enquiry, it must not be forgotten that all parties appealed to history and regarded the Church as the guardian of an historic faith. Christianity

must have a definite content, or there is nothing to enquire about and no theology is possible. So Laud wrote :

“Somewhat must be believed before much can be known . . . even in mathematics there are *quædam postulata* . . . therefore who can deny to Divinity what is easily and reasonably granted to inferior sciences ? ”

So Jeremy Taylor writes of the Creed :

“This symbol is the one sufficient, immoveable, unalterable, and unchangeable rule of Faith, that admits no increment or decrement ; but if the integrity of this be preserved, in all other things men may take a liberty of enlarging their knowledge and prophesying according as they are assisted by the grace of God.”

In consequence we conclude that the Church of England bases itself on what she believes to be facts, which may be interpreted anew in every age, and refuses to tie herself to any particular theories which are certain to grow out of date as knowledge advances or the philosophic climate varies. The Church never adopted an official textbook—not Usher’s *Summe of Divinity*, or Hammond’s *Practical Catechism*, or Burnet’s *Thirty-Nine Articles*, but generations of ordination candidates were required to study Pearson’s *Exposition of the Creed*—a very good book too, now too much neglected. We should not forget that the critical Bentley, speaking of Pearson, said, “The dust of his writings is gold.”

III

We may now pass to some of the characteristics common to Anglican theologians in the seventeenth century.

First of all, they were and had to be very Scriptural.

In England the Bible was an open book which was then really read by the laity, and a good textuary was much admired. Some of the expositions may seem to us very wire-drawn, but Coleridge was surely right in saying :

“ There is something . . . at once elevating and soothing in the idea of an order of learned men, reading the many works of the wise and great in many languages, for the purpose of making one book contain the life and virtue of all others, for their brethren’s use, who have but that one to read.”

Secondly, these Anglican divines did really read the Fathers, and not merely those quotations which had become the commonplaces of controversy. As the century proceeds they are less and less at the mercy of the Schoolmen who had attempted to harmonize the Fathers and systematize the results of their teaching.

In an age when the study of Greek was declining in France and almost dead in Italy, England was especially devoted to the Greek Fathers. The first great patristic work published in England was the Eton *Chrysostom*, edited by Sir Henry Savile with the assistance of Bois and Hales, while the best critical work of the century was done by Usher and Pearson in defence of the Ignatian Epistles. Never were Athanasius, Nazianzus, and the two Cyrils more frequently quoted, and this accounts for the fact that the doctrine of the Incarnation, and not the Atonement, was the centre of their theology. So, Westcott and the *Lux Mundi* School were, rather than the Tractarians, the true heirs to the Caroline Divines.

Thirdly, we must remember that these Anglican

theologians had no professional training. They were not the products of Seminaries or of Religious Orders. They went to the same Schools and Universities as the laity and read in their early years the same books. This gave them a wider outlook, and also a wider appeal. We are not surprised when Hooker quotes Sophocles, or that some theologians use all manner of strange knowledge by way of illustration. We may perhaps be staggered when we take up a book called *Holy Living and Dying*, and find Jeremy Taylor elaborating stories taken from Petronius Arbiter with a view to Christian edification.

Fourthly, we note that the individuality of these theologians adds much to the interest of their works. They were not, many of them, written in academic surroundings, but were penned by parish priests in the country. With all their immense learning they often betray the minds of men who have lived much alone. Hooker before beginning his great work asked to be removed into the country, "where I might behold God's blessing spring out of the earth, and eat my own bread without opposition." Hammond wrote in the quiet of Penshurst or from his refuge at Westwood. Sanderson's great book on Conscience and most of Thorndike's books were written in the country. At Suddington George Bull wrote his *Defence of the Nicene Creed* and *Harmonia Apostolica*.

It is surprising also how much of the best work was done when the Church was overthrown and the clergy deprived. We think first of Walton's great Polyglot Version of the Bible, of Pocock's Oriental Studies, of Cosin's *History of Transubstantiation*, and

of Archbishop Bramhall writing controversial works of value at a time when he earned his living by selling fish in a Dutch town.

It is easy to criticize Anglican theology because of its controversial tone, but this was largely due to the method of education which prevailed. The grammar-school boy was trained to dispute and rose in form by proving his fellow wrong. The undergraduate learned logic through continual wrangling with a moderator to apportion praise and blame. A degree was obtained after a lively *viva voce* examination called a Disputation, when there was an audience to applaud or hiss the aspirant for honours. With such an education it is not surprising that public debates should subsequently be arranged. Laud and Usher both met Jesuits in controversy. We are told that Tombes, the Anabaptist, and Baxter "disputed face to face, and their followers were like two armies," while of Gunning, Anthony à Wood tells us, "there was no considerable sect, but he held with them, some time or other, a set disputation in defence of the Church of England."

Well might Sir Henry Wotton say *Pruritus disputandi ecclesiarum scabies*; while Dury, who tried so hard to arrange a Lausanne Conference three centuries too soon, wrote:

"Their young scholars, being trained up in these ways of contentious learning, for want of better teaching, prove in their ministry very often void of all charitableness, and strangers to peaceable affections."

In vain Bishop Andrews wrote:

"A false conceit is crept into the minds of men to think the points of religion that be manifest to be certain petty

points. Those, yea, those be great and none but those that have great disputes about them. It is not so. Those that are necessary God hath made plain ; those that are not plain, not necessary."

In vain Laud attempted to restrict preaching to Gospel truths and moral instruction. Men, like Milton's devils, preferred to reason high

Of Providence, Foreknowledge, Will and Fate,
Fixt Fate, Free Will, Foreknowledge absolute,
And found no end in wandering mazes lost.

It was a sensible layman, Sir Philip Warwick, who wrote :

"It is much more necessary for us men to know what God positively hath determined in relation to our duty, than what in point of decree He hath preordained in order to our salvation."

But notwithstanding "the darkness and confusion which was upon the face of the controversies of Dort," a great deal may be said about the good manners of Anglican controversialists. There are very few personalities and very little abuse.

This brings me to my last point. Amid all the confusion and disputes, the English Church was vindicating herself in the lives of her saints. They were of all parties—Richard Hooker, Lancelot Andrewes, William Bedell, George Herbert, Nicholas Ferrar, Joseph Hall, Henry Hammond, Benjamin Whichcote, Robert Leighton, Thomas Ken, and, last but not least, he who for so long outlived them all, Thomas Wilson. There were during this period many parties in the Church, but in thinking of such men we remember that there is but one Communion of Saints.

MOVEMENTS IN THE CHURCH OF
ENGLAND

MYSTICISM IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

By R. ELLIS ROBERTS, B.A.

THE simple, devout man worships and is an example. The theologian reasons, and convinces us. The mystic sees, and inspires us. The nature of his vision and the quality of his inspiration will depend on variations in time and place, on the depth of his character and the idiosyncrasies of his temperament. Recently one of the ablest of our philosophic theologians, Dr. Tennant, has urged that the claims of some mystics to special knowledge is invalidated because their visions are evidently conditioned by their knowledge, their religious environment and the state of contemporary learning. Yet surely this is no argument against the content of their message ; all expression of truth is so conditioned—the most abstract ideas have to be expressed by the purest of thinkers in a language which he knows and in words which will often betray his period, his reading and his education. What strikes the student of mystical writers most forcibly is the way in which their testimony agrees. No doubt this is partly due to the fact that there is some conscious, and much unconscious, borrowing ; but when this has been taken into account, there remains a remarkable

similarity in the thought of mystical writers separated by centuries from each other, and adhering to different religions or different faiths. The devout, simple man asked to worship in a strange fashion with men of a different religion is troubled ; the theologian brought into close contact with the theologian of another religion argues or denounces ; the mystic—even of different faiths, such as Buddhism or Islam—finds himself on the same path as the mystics of Christianity and striving for the perfect contemplation of the same Ineffable Reality. Within the Christian Church this agreement is startling. Take, for instance, a subject which has for centuries perplexed the minds of men—the nature of the world to come, the meaning of Heaven and Hell. We all know how the Church in the Middle Ages pictured the doom of the damned, and the felicity of the saved ; it is sometimes claimed that not until our time has a less crude eschatology been enunciated. Yet these are the words of the anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, an English mystical treatise of the fourteenth century, the great century of English medieval mysticism :

“ For heaven ghostly is as nigh down, as up, and up as down ; behind as before, before as behind, on one side as other. Insomuch that whoso had a true desire for to be at heaven, then that same time he were in heaven ghostly. For the high and the next way thither is run by desires, and not by paces of feet.”

Two hundred and fifty years later you find John Donne, the greatest Dean of St. Paul's, declaring that the final pain of Hell is the sense of the deprivation of the presence of God ; and in the next generation

you have the clear testimony of Benjamin Whichcote, one of the Cambridge Platonists :

“ The fuel of Tophet burning is the guiltiness of men’s conscience, indignity and a naughty disposition against goodness and holiness ; and God’s withdrawing because the person is incapable of His communication.”

The study of the mystics will help us, as no other study does, to move out of the controversies which disable our religion, for the mystics, at their best and most characteristic, are inhabitants of a region where controversy is resolved in contemplation, and argument is overcome by a vision of that which is beyond discussion. The mystics do not despise theology ; many of them have laid great stress on the value of organized religion and of the discipline of the Catholic Church ; but they are always and anxiously aware of the limitations of theology and the dangers of organized religion. No doubt those who are afraid that God will escape from the categories we have made will always be alarmed at the boldness of the mystical affirmation ; but those of us who remember that all our categories are really presumptuous, at their very best but an approximation to the truth, will rejoice in the work of those who can never forget that all worship of God, all thought about God, is subject to the weakness and inadequacy of human nature, that even the vision of God vouchsafed to them is only perfect when it is incommunicable, only completely true when it has passed beyond dream, or thought, or imagination. For, as the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* writes :

God “ may not be found by any work of the soul, but all only by love of thine heart. He may not be known by

reason. He may not be gotten by thought, nor concluded by understanding ; but he may be loved and chosen with the true lovely will of thine heart."

The mystical approach to God, that is the attempt to attain an immediate apprehension of his being and character, is found in England, as elsewhere, first in the poets. There are traces of mysticism in Caedmon's poems ; and only a mystic, whether it be Cynewulf or another, could have written the lovely *Dream of the Rood*, with its noble confession of the eternal value of the Cross. It is not, however, until the fourteenth century that we find in England mystical literature which, while it has its own distinctive, racial qualities, shares the great European tradition. That tradition derives, through the writings of Dionysius, from the Platonic and neo-Platonic philosophy, and may have a remote relation to the wisdom of Egypt. It must not, however, be forgotten that, great as was the influence of the Platonic tradition, all mystics, of whatever school and whatever religion, found their chief source in Holy Scripture. I have said that the mystics, like all other men, bear unmistakable signs of their period and their race, and it is these distinctive signs of English mysticism which I desire to emphasize ; for they form an invaluable contribution to the common store of mystical wisdom, and are found in the poets and saints of this island before and after the Reformation. There are four great mystical writers of the fourteenth century—the author of *The Cloud of Unknowing*, Richard Rolle, Walter Hylton, and Julian, the anchoress of Norwich. The great danger of mysticism is solitariness. It may be that many of the great saints have begun with a

firm conviction that, as Newman says, there are two, and two only, supreme realities, God and one's own soul ; but to rest there is a grave error, destructive of the very idea of Christianity and of the Christian conception of God. I would not say that any Christian mystic has given support to that nihilism ; but there are some in whose writings I feel a tendency to it. Their vision becomes insufficiently objective ; one suspects that they are in danger, not perhaps of believing, but of acting as if they believed, that God *is* merely that He may be the object of their vision that they forget the gulf between the creature and the Creator, and the bond between the creature and his fellows. From this fault the English mystics are conspicuously free. The writings of the four medieval authors I have named are instinct with a companionable humility, and with a sense of their normal dependence on the life of the Catholic Church. Julian asserts plainly that

“ From the beginning to the end I had two manners of beholding. The one was endless, continuent love, with secureness of keeping and blissful salvation, for of this was all the shewing. The other was of the common teaching of Holy Church, in which I was before informed and grounded, and with all my will having in use and understanding.”

Her mystical vision, that is, was used to corroborate the common life of the Church, not to make her separate, or unusual, or in any way better than her fellows ; for “ it was not shewed me that God loved me better than the least soul that is in grace.” You find the same warning against presumptuously claiming any spiritual superiority in Hylton's *Scale of Perfection* :

“Thou shalt neither judge other men, nor conceive wilfully against them evil suspicion. But thou shalt love them, and worship them in thine heart, such as lead an active life, and suffer many tribulations and temptations which thou sitting in thy house feelest nought of.”

or again ;

“As mickle as thou lovest God and thine even-Christian, so mickle is thy soul.”

It is this sense of fellowship which has preserved English mysticism from the danger of that quietism which we find in some of the Spanish and French mystics ; for this note is heard, quite as strongly, in such men as Donne, Herbert, Vaughan and Traherne, that seventeenth-century fellowship, not unworthy to be named with the great writers of the Middle Ages. The same note is heard even in the last great mystic whom, in the absence of other allegiance, I may perhaps claim for the Church of England. No man, perhaps, has lived more truly, more audaciously in the world of solitary vision than William Blake, yet in the greatest of his Prophetical Books he asks :

“Wouldest thou love one who never died for thee
Or die for one who had not died for thee ?
And if God died not for man, and giveth not Himself
Eternally for man, man could not exist, for Man is love
As God is love. Every kindness to another is a little death
In the Divine Image, nor can Man exist but by Brother-
hood.”

When the brotherhood is thus clearly remembered, there is no danger that the mystic will fall into that error by which God becomes a Being whose interest is, however unconsciously, supposed to be entirely centred on one soul, becomes a kind of private luxury, a God whose relationship to oneself is no longer

cherished and preserved as an example of His unspeakable love for all others, but is kept and treasured selfishly, till the Incomprehensible shrinks to the dimensions of His greedy worshipper.

Then in the English mystics we find a proper insistence on the separateness of man, on the importance, the privilege of God's gift to him of reason and of will. I must not be understood as implying that other mystics do not believe in reason and in will; but in the English I find their place in the mystical life very clearly stated. The tribute of the medievalists to reason is found, of course, in their agreement with scholastic theology, which has been stated by a modern philosopher to be the last philosophic system which insists on the rule and supremacy of reason. The appeal to reason is, again, one of the most distinctive marks of the Cambridge Platonists, those men whose comparatively small influence on the Church of England is one of the puzzles of seventeenth-century ecclesiastical history. "The reason of a man's mind," says Whichcote, "must be satisfied; no man can think against it." And Culverwell asks, "Why should there be any strife between faith and reason, seeing that they are brethren? Do they not both spring from the same Father of Light; and can the Fountain of Love and Unity send forth an irreconcilable stream?" You find in these men, too, an equal insistence on will. No doubt it was partly from Boehme that William Law, the non-juror, learnt to emphasize the truth of man's free will, so that it can prevail even against God, for, he says, heaven and hell are "no foreign, separate and imposed states

adjudged to us by the will of God ” ; but you find the same doctrine in Whichcote—that man’s final condition depends on the act of his own will—“ There is no judgment from God, if men be harmless and not self-condemned.” It is worth noting that Dr. Pusey, a doctor very remote from the mystical character, made the same declaration, with even greater emphasis, in his answer to Dean Farrar on the subject of eternal punishment. The joy of English mystics may be not unreasonably attributed to their keen sense of man’s spiritual power, in the exercise of which happiness can be found as nowhere else. I would speak only with the greatest reverence of such inspired saints as Theresa of Jesus and John of the Cross ; yet do we not discern in their writings a sombreness, an occlusion of joy, that are not so characteristic of Christian experience as the livelier wisdom of some of our own mystics ? It is an error to accuse S. John of advocating a complete renunciation of everything but the sense of the immediate presence of God : his cry for renunciation only echoes that of our Lord—

“ That thou mayst have pleasure in everything, seek pleasure in nothing. That thou mayst know everything, seek to know nothing. That thou mayst possess all things, seek to possess nothing.”

But his teaching has not the brightness, the sunny assurance of such a poet as Traherne, with his “ We were made in God’s Image. . . . It must of necessity follow that God’s treasures be our treasures, and His joys our joys,” or “ Here upon earth souls love what God hates, and hate what God loves. Did they keep their eyes open always upon what he loves, and see his love to them, and to all, they could not choose

but love as he does.” That note of joy is conspicuous in the mystical writing of the last century, except, strangely enough, in the work of the only Anglican mystic. While students of mysticism owe a great debt to two living Anglican scholars, Dr. Inge and Miss Evelyn Underhill, we must admit that for additions to the creative literature of mysticism we are dependent on those outside our communion, with one exception. In the work of Christina Rossetti there is an intense, if conscious, beauty, a spiritual awareness which can be compared to the precious things of the seventeenth century. But for the typical note of assured happiness, of confirmed joy, we have to turn to our brethren of the Latin rite—to Coventry Patmore, to Francis Thompson, to Gerard Hopkins. In their work, as in all mystical poetry that admits the Christian symbol, and in the theological writing of Friedrich von Hügel, we hear, clear and with a lively distinctness, the age-long protest against what is once more becoming a danger to our world, a protest against the easy and convenient creed of pantheism. It is the poets who are the best protection against that heresy; for it is the poets who see so vividly all that is beautiful and true in pantheism, and yet are not content to rest in a philosophy which makes God circumscribed by His Universe. Beyond the splendours of the visible world, beyond the magnificent spectacle disclosed by science, beyond the unimagined mysteries of time and space, they see the same vision as that revealed to the seer of Patmos:

“The Spouse
Christ, and the Mother of Christ and all his hallows.”

THE BROAD CHURCH AND MODERNIST MOVEMENT

BY THE REV. CANON B. H. STREETER, D.D., F.B.A.,
FELLOW OF THE QUEEN'S COLLEGE, OXFORD, CANON OF
HEREFORD

MODERNISTS are not a party in the Church, comparable to the "High Church" or "Low Church" parties; they are a group of persons who, looking round on a civilization that is like to perish for lack of a Religion, wish to offer it a Religion which is intellectually a possible one. On the points in regard to which High Church and Low Church are at variance, Modernists are divided among themselves. Some of them like High Mass, others dislike it. But they all agree in thinking that the immediate problem confronting the Church is, not whether the next generation is to be High Church or Low, but whether it is to be Christian at all.

If some of them are members of a Society, *The Churchman's Union*, or subscribe to a magazine, *The Modern Churchman* (which seem to be of a party character), that is merely because in the past Modernists have, either found themselves exposed to active persecution, or made the discovery that other religious periodicals were closed to articles discussing with freedom and candour problems of Christian thought which seemed to them vital. But while to the

editors of certain religious papers there is ascribed by large circles of their readers an all but papal infallibility, no Modernist, however great his affection or respect for Dr. Major, was ever heard to remark, with the solemn air of one citing a final authority, "*The Modern Churchman says.*"

To the Modernist truth is primary. He has, therefore no party programme ; he has a point of view. In "the first and great commandment" as reaffirmed by Christ it is written, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God . . . with all thy mind." The Modernist believes that this part of the commandment was intended to be taken seriously. That does not mean that every cobbler must be a theologian ; it does mean that the Church as a corporate society is under the obligation to strive always to make its theology, from an intellectual standpoint, the best possible. And having done so, it is the duty of the Church to popularize the results, to the extent of making sure that the cobbler's understanding of things religious is not intellectually on a lower level than such understanding of political, economic, and scientific matters, as he derives from the school, the newspaper, and the popular magazine.

I lay stress on this question of popularization. It is the fashion among opponents of Modernism to speak as if Modernists were primarily interested in academic questions, or in the religious problems of the highly educated. When I read the writings of some of those who make this charge, I cannot refrain from asking whether they ever read the novels, magazine articles, and works of popular essayists, which form the principal mental pabulum of the

urban population of this country. If they did, it might possibly occur to them that the larger part of what they themselves produce is written in what is at the present day an *unknown tongue*, so far as the great majority of people are concerned; and deals with questions which, because without meaning to them, are also without interest—since they seem to be out of relation to the problems of real life.

For the discussion of moral and religious questions, the younger generation—of the class sufficiently educated to enjoy plays and novels, and not wholly frivolous—are largely dependent on writers like Mr. Bernard Shaw or Mr. H. G. Wells. And since so many people do go to Mr. Wells for their theology, you will, I think, agree with me that it is a matter for congratulation that, taken over a period of years, Mr. Wells' theology has steadily improved. Any one who aspires to present these people with a theology which he believes to be superior, philosophically or ethically, to that of Mr. Wells must imitate Mr. Wells to the extent of thinking, writing, and preaching in the language of the contemporary world; and he must express himself in relation to its conceptions. That is what the Modernist is trying to do. And if his orthodox critics think he does it badly, may I remind them of the notice stuck up in an entertainment hall in the "Wild West": "You are requested not to shoot the pianist; he does his best." The Modernist is engaged on a difficult, and even risky, process; but if *he* shirks it, nobody else will attempt it at all.

As regards that part of the population that is below the level of education which enjoys Mr. Wells'

novels, a distinction requires to be drawn between the country and the town. So far as the towns are concerned there are three considerations of the first importance, which are apt to be ignored, not only by the clergy but by the majority of the educated laity.

(1) It is untrue to say "there is nothing new under the sun." Compulsory education has created a position in regard to religion which really is *new*. In all ages among the educated few a certain amount of sceptical rationalism has flourished ; but heretofore the mass of the uneducated has always taken for granted the existence of a God or gods, and therefore the necessity of some kind of religious observance. The new thing in the modern situation is the spread of the spirit of criticism and enquiry, in regard to matters of religion and morals, to the masses of the people. The scepticism of the Hyde Park orator is as crude and unintelligent as the credulity which it is in process of displacing ; his arguments, as he actually propounds them, can usually, with small difficulty, be rebutted ; but that is not my point. My point is that the masses have *begun to ask questions*. They know that what was once supposed to be unquestionable is questioned. They are aware that religious belief, in the form they have come across it in Sunday School and in the average sermon, is rejected by large numbers of the educated classes. Intellectual problems as such may be above the comprehension of the multitude ; but, as the result of the diffusion of cheap reading in the modern world, the multitude follows a generation or so later the lead of the thinkers.

The charwoman may not be directly troubled by doubts suggested by Darwin; but her daughter Jane, who is in service with Mr. X, reputed the cleverest young doctor in the town, tells her that her master "Doesn't 'old with religion," and says that "the Bible isn't true." Her son John, who has learnt a little elementary science at a Secondary School—enough to show that Genesis is shaky—gives a similar report. The old dear herself continues to go to Church occasionally; but even for her, Religion has lost the prestige it once had, and for her children it will have no prestige to lose.

(2) To most of us here Christianity is associated with historic memories, with the glorious architecture of cathedrals and churches, with its incomparable literature in the Authorized Version of the Bible and the Book of Common Prayer. To the educated, however sceptically minded, these things make a strong appeal. It is otherwise among the working classes of our large industrial cities. In their minds Christianity is associated with a political and economic *status quo*, which many view with hostility, and few with more than tolerance. It is the religion professed by the classes with whom they are in constant economic conflict. This condition of things prevails far less in England than on the Continent. On the Continent the Socialist is *ipso facto* an Atheist, and Christianity is daily denounced as a subtle device of the *bourgeois* to drug the people into acquiescence with deprivation of what is justly theirs. You will not suppose that I am defending this point of view; I am merely pointing out that there are forces at work among the masses of the people which

produce individuals passionately interested in making the utmost of any weak points in the intellectual presentation of Christianity. The conflict of Religion and Science is a question far more hotly debated in the slums of Birmingham than in the Common-rooms of Oxford.

(3) Turn now to the problems the Missionary has to face, more especially in India and China. At the World Conference on Missions which took place at Jerusalem last Easter, one of the most striking manifestations was, I am told, the demand—most strongly voiced by representatives from China—for a presentation of Christianity which can hold its own intellectually in these countries at a moment when they are enthusiastically adopting the methods and outlook of Western Science. What the Christian Church to-day has most to fear, they said, is not the old religions of the East (which they regard as moribund), but the secularism of the West. A few months ago I had a letter from a leading Chinese Christian informing me that my recent books, *Reality* and *Adventure*, were being used in China for Study Circles, and asking my consent to the translation of the book *Reality* into Chinese. The problems it dealt with, he explained, and the way in which they were approached, supplied what Chinese Christians were feeling was most needed at the present moment, if Christianity was to hold its own. It is with hesitation that I make this reference to my own work. I do so, as it happens to be the easiest way to answer the persons who are always accusing Modernists of being out of contact with the practical religious needs of the real world.

Someone will object—and the objection is, up to a point, a sound one—that the discussion of problems, such as Theism versus Materialism, or Religion and the New Psychology, or the Historical evidence for the Life of Christ, involves the weighing of subtle and delicate considerations which, from the nature of the case, are incapable of being stated in a way which would appeal to an uneducated audience. The mass of the people, it will be urged, must accept their beliefs in regard to such questions on authority. I agree ; but I go on to ask : On what, or on whose, authority ? The range of human knowledge is now so vast that even one who had the brain of an Aristotle or Aquinas would be compelled to accept at second hand, in regard to most branches of knowledge, the results arrived at by experts in their own field. Sometimes one accepts results on this kind of authority without any profession of understanding them. I myself am prepared to accept, on the ground that those best competent to judge appear to be agreed in doing so, the famous theory of Einstein. But if you ask me whether I understand it, I can only confess that my attempts to do so have led me to the conviction that, by comparison with this, the doctrine of the Trinity is simplicity itself.

There is in the modern world no fundamental distinction between educated and uneducated in the matter of the necessity of accepting the major part of one's beliefs on the authority of persons whom one has reason to believe qualified to pronounce an opinion. What, then, is it that gives certain persons the qualification which enables them to speak with authority ? In regard to Science, History, Economics,

etc., the answer is clear. Authority belongs to the consensus of experts ; that is, the results agreed upon by the majority of persons who give a life study to the subject, use the best methods, and are judged to be actuated solely by the desire to ascertain the truth.

But observe, the first and most necessary condition of the acceptance by outsiders of such agreed opinion as authoritative is that the outsiders believe that the experts are using the most up-to-date methods and are animated by the sole desire to ascertain truth—in fact, that the investigations which they undertake are genuine investigations. If it were laid down beforehand that the investigator was bound in some way or other to reach a particular conclusion, that conclusion would carry no weight at all. It is sometimes a man's duty, not to investigate facts, but to plead a cause. It is the duty of a barrister, for example, to make out the best case he can for his client ; but nobody would accept his speech to the jury as an authoritative pronouncement—unless, indeed, it were the ingenuous old lady who bought a certain article because “the advertisements spoke so well of it.”

Now the popular belief is that, in the matter of Christian doctrines, the theologian is playing the part of the barrister, that is, of a man who conceives it his duty, not to investigate truth, but to defend tradition. What I wish to insist is that under modern conditions, if the Church desires to speak to the World with the voice of authority, it must first compel outsiders to recognize that there is within the Church a body of investigators who are

in no way bound to defend established positions, but are free to follow truth. It must not merely tolerate such investigators ; it must insist on having them.

The relation of the parish clergyman to these investigators will be very similar to that of the general practitioner to the experts engaged in original medical research in the great hospitals. Medical research would be of little value to humanity unless there was a large body of men, not actively engaged in research themselves, but occupied in bringing the results of such research to bear on the individual needs of men and women throughout the country. Nor, again, would the researcher have the materials on which to work, were there not an organization whereby cases too difficult for the ordinary practitioner could be brought to the notice of a specialist. Religion, like medicine, is more of an art than a science ; and if the theologian in his study loses contact with the actual facts of human life and human experience, he has lost contact with the most important part of the material on which his theologizing must be based. But it is no less true that the person whose main task is to deal with the concrete problem presented by human souls may often fail through approaching the case with his mind pre-occupied with a theoretical theology, which is unrelated to the mental outlook of the soul he is endeavouring to help.

Let me vary the metaphor. If the parish clergy constitute the firing-line of the Church, it is to the theologian they must look for the supply of munitions. But munitions, to be effective, must be up to date.

THE EVANGELICAL MOVEMENT

BY THE REV. C. M. CHAVASSE, M.A., M.C., RECTOR OF
ST. PETER-LE-BAILEY, OXFORD

THE history of Organized Religion has very largely been the reacting of two complementary tendencies—the one Evangelical, with its emphasis upon the direct relationship of the individual soul with God, and the other Institutional, with stress laid on the ordinances of the Church.

Evangelicals therefore form part of that stream which in the Old Testament was “Prophetic” as distinguished from “Priestly,” or which emerged in Christendom at the conclusion of the Dark Ages in the rise of St. Francis ; or which in our own land has been represented by the Lollards, the Reformers and the Puritans.

When this Evangelical stream has not flowed strongly, there has been darkness and death. But its inevitable revival, which has always accompanied a renaissance of thought and learning, has consecrated that renaissance to the awakening of the Church and the revolution of Society.

Evangelicalism therefore has no quarrel with Organized Religion, of which it is indeed the inner life ; and it has only been forced at times into opposing it when institutionalism has threatened to strangle its inspiration.

So it was with that great Evangelical Movement of the early eighteenth century which gave birth to what is known still as the Evangelical School in the Church.

The nation, sunk under a wave of materialism, was brutal and profligate. As for religion, a strong Churchman like Dr. Johnson was forced to confess "that he had never been acquainted with a religious clergyman," while Addison declared that there was "less appearance of religion in England than in any other neighbouring state, Catholic or Protestant." But the Spirit of God was already moving upon those dark waters. There was abroad a spirit of revolt against unreality, and of adventure for freedom and truth, which culminated in the French Revolution and in the Industrial Revolution, and found its echo in the Romantic School of literature. But the Religious Revolution came first, for God would always offer to men the spiritual equipment wherewith to meet the opportunities of a new age. Signs of awakening were first rumoured from Wales and Cornwall, and then in 1738, with the Field Preaching of Wesley and Whitfield, there swept through the land the greatest Religious Revival since the days of the Reformation, "which brought strength and earnestness into half the homes of England." ¹

The Church has never possessed a more devoted son than John Wesley, yet it was the bitter hostility of his Church which deprives us to-day of thirty million fellow-members; and it was the rashness of Wesley himself which finally forced the rupture. But even before the Rubicon had been crossed in 1784 the forces of the Revival had begun to fall part, and while the

¹ Archbishop Davidson.

term of "Methodist" became confined to those who eventually seceded, those who, despite all discouragement and persecution, refused to be driven from the Church were given the name of "Evangelical."

It is well to remember that for over a hundred years (that is, during half the time of their existence) Evangelicals were struggling desperately for toleration in the Church they loved, and were never free from organized efforts, first from High and Low Churchmen alike and then from Tractarians, to force them into secession. Even when the first storm of persecution and actual violence was spent, they could look for no preferment till the rise of the Palmerston Bishops; and it is significant that the fathers of the C.M.S. were nearly all unbeneficed clergy. As late as 1820 the Bishop of Peterborough invented his famous trap of eighty-seven questions designed to exclude Evangelicals from his diocese, and but for the creation of Evangelical Trusts the movement, humanly speaking, must have perished in the Church.

This also explains why Evangelicals founded those great Societies which still form their glory; they were rendered necessary because their leaders were boycotted by the older Societies, even though they subscribed to them.

Finally the Oxford Movement brought matters to a head by including Evangelicals in their heresy prosecutions. In 1850 the whole Evangelical School fought for its life in the protracted "Gorham" case on Baptismal Regeneration till at length the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council ruled in their favour and they were saved from extrusion. In 1859 the English Church Union was formed and clamoured for

such ecclesiastical litigation. Unhappily, their lead was followed by a strong section of Evangelicals six years later, who won case after case. But they proved barren victories ; the Islington Conference in 1883 strongly denounced what it called "this disastrous policy," and it ceased soon after with the Lincoln Judgment. Yet such prosecutions did serve two useful purposes. As the Church Association intended, they were test cases which both determined what was the law of the Church of England, on which even Archbishop Tait confessed himself ignorant and therefore helpless ; and also they established the Evangelical School as holding the doctrine of the Reformers themselves, which a succession of the greatest of English Divines had maintained ever since.

What, then, could Evangelicals give to a Church which consistently scorned and opposed them ? And my spirit kneels as I record achievements which Lecky compares with the first days of Christianity.

I must pass over their real work, for no one can measure spiritual re-birth ; and yet by enumerating their practical achievements we can arrive at some estimate of the inner spirit which effected them.

1. First, then, as is natural for those imbued with a passion for souls, Evangelicals were born pastors, and revolutionized the whole field of Parochial Ministration. Thus, Bishop Sumner of Winchester has been called the first of the modern type of Bishop, whose innovations have become part of the accepted machinery of Diocesan Organization.

Likewise, Evangelical clergy introduced hymn-

singing into Church Services and are themselves the "Old Masters" ¹ of English hymnology. To them also are due our Sunday Schools, in which to-day seven hundred thousand teachers instruct seven million children.

They popularized the observance of Lent and Holy Week ; and in order to offer greater opportunity for receiving the Sacrament they introduced, about 1820, the innovation of eight o'clock Communion ; even as for the same reason the famous High Churchman, Dr. Hook of Leeds, introduced evening Communion thirty years later.

And all those aggressive methods, by which the pastor goes after other sheep, are entirely of their creation. It is typical that the founding of the "Church Pastoral Aid Society" was the first effort made in the Church to tackle the problem of the huge pagan populations created by the Industrial Revolution ; and that, despite strong opposition, the Society stood firm to its experiment of employing laymen also in the work of evangelization.

2. In the second place, their passion for souls predestined Evangelicals to become the missionary agents of the Church, and the more so because they were refused at home an outlet for the evangelistic fires within them.

So it is that the "World Call" is the sequel and result of the founding of the C.M.S. in 1799, which with its kindred societies maintains to-day over three-fifths of the Church's work abroad ; ² while another

¹ Bishop Strong in *The Oxford Hymn Book*.

² See Church Assembly Missionary Council "Budget," 1928.

Evangelical child, the Bible Society, distributes each year ten million copies of the Gospel in over six hundred different tongues.

3. Thirdly, the practical zeal of Evangelicals inspired them to achieve a record of Social Reform that has been equalled only by the Quakers.

In 1807 William Wilberforce and "the Clapham Sect" of Evangelical business-men abolished the Slave Trade: a work which another Evangelical, Sir Thomas Fowell Buxton, completed twenty years later by effecting the ransom of all slaves in British Possessions. So was there carried through, in the teeth of the fiercest opposition, what Lecky has called "one of the three or four perfectly virtuous acts recorded in the history of nations," and as Dr. Overton has testified, it was the work "not only of Evangelicals but of Evangelicalism."

Then Lord Shaftesbury took up the torch and, with the backing of Exeter Hall, fought for sixteen years, till in 1847 he placed his Factory Acts upon the statute book. And such are only the typical labours of representative leaders, for as Lord Shaftesbury himself witnessed at the end of a long life, "Most of the great philanthropic movements of the century have sprung from Evangelicals."

4. Finally, it is through Evangelical influence that the Church has arrived at its present friendly relations with what Bishop Hall calls "the sister Churches of the Reformation." The Lambeth Appeal on Reunion is one of the greatest fruits of the movement. To-day Evangelicalism in the Mission Field is presenting the practical opportunity of One Reformed Church; that first and decisive step towards the

reunion of Christendom ! And would to God that the Evangelical Movement might add this crowning service to what the Holy Spirit has already used it to accomplish !

Now any movement depends upon the personality of its leaders even more than upon the loftiness of its teaching. When, therefore, we inquire who were the men through whom these amazing results were wrought in spite of continual opposition, we are surprised to discern (apart from the laymen, in whom they have been rich beyond compare) no leader in any way exceptional save in saintliness and strength of character. The fact is all the greater evidence of the guidance of the Spirit of God. But there is the further explanation that the movement has always been practical rather than scholastic or diplomatic : to revive with spiritual life a Church whose formularies they already accepted ; to emphasize neglected doctrines which were nevertheless a permanent part of the Christian faith ; and, with singular ability for organization, to make their Gospel active and effectual. This will be clearly recognized if we divide the history of the movement into four periods of fifty years each.

1. The first period is from Wesley to the French Revolution in 1790. This is the age of the Evangelical Fathers. There was John Newton, the converted slaver, who was co-author with Cowper of the Olney hymns, and the great spiritual director of Evangelicals ; William Grimshaw, once the typical hard-drinking parson of the period, whose Yorkshire ministry became a romance and whose converts thronged the Lord's

Table in numbers which stagger the imagination ; Thomas Scott, formerly a cocksure curate with Unitarian views, afterwards the great commentator to whom said Newman, " I almost owe my soul " ; and William Romaine, " a very, very vain young man " till God showed him himself, when it was said of him that " he lived more with God than with men," and he became for forty-six years the foremost preacher in London. These were all living examples of the power of the Gospel which they preached, and time would fail me if I tell of Henry Venn, who worked himself to death at Huddersfield, but whose influence still lived on through his devotional writings ; or of the learned Milner brothers who established Evangelicalism in Hull and Cambridge ; or of John William Fletcher of Madeley, the greatest saint John Wesley had ever met or of whom Voltaire had ever heard.

Of such were that apostolic band who have been called " the second founders of the Church of England."

2. From them arose that great second generation who, though hampered by the suspicions engendered by the French Revolution, had yet definitely established Evangelicalism as the greatest power in the Church by the time of the Oxford Movement. This was the age of " the Clapham Sect." It also saw the rise of the great Evangelical Societies, and the creation of parochial organization under such pioneers as Daniel Wilson of Islington and William Champneys of Whitechapel. While if Evangelical leaders received little official recognition, yet they wielded enormous influence—Charles Simeon, said Macaulay, exerted

at Cambridge "a sway over the Church far greater than that of any Primate"; Francis Close "was the Pope of Cheltenham," according to *The Times*; and Hugh McNeile altered the whole face of Church life in Liverpool. Of such men Dr. Overton writes: "They were the salt of the earth in their day"; and another High Churchman, Canon Liddon, thus sums up the period: "The deepest and most fervid religion in England during the first three decades of the nineteenth century was that of the Evangelicals."

3. The rise of the Oxford Movement in 1840 began a third and difficult period of controversy which continued down to the Lincoln Judgment of 1892, and in which Evangelicals were forced to exchange the urge of a noble objective for the dangerous rôle of opposition.

Moreover, the controversy assumed a dual character, both against an anti-reformation movement, and in defence of the Inspiration of Scripture. It was also a tragedy that a development of artistic appreciation and a fresh advance in Science and Biblical scholarship should have coincided and become confused with a borrowing of Roman ornaments from the Continent and a rationalistic philosophy from Germany. For Evangelicals were thus, not unnaturally, sometimes betrayed into contending upon the wrong issues or over non-essentials.

It is stated that during this period the movement lost some of its salt. But it would be truer to say that the salt lost itself (as salt should) by permeating every section of the Church. Also, by the exigencies of controversy, Evangelicals became popularly iden-

tified with Low Churchmen, who (in the phrases of Sydney Smith) turned from attacking "the nasty and numerous vermin of Methodism" to exterminate "the pragmatistical, perpendicular, Puseyite prigs." And it must be added, as official recognition had quenched the fires of persecution, their growing ranks were no longer purged of slackers and lip-servers.

Yet after admitting the worst, these were the days of the Factory Acts; of an immense expansion in Foreign Missions; and when Moody's visit originated that Mission Movement from which sprang the Church Army, and a widespread longing for greater holiness produced the Keswick Convention; while in all these labours there worked that self-same Spirit, as of old, uniting Evangelicals and the Free Churches in fruitful co-operation.

4. We thus enter the last period of our own times. There is still controversy—though it is conducted upon the positive lines of education, as exemplified by the National Church League or the "Groups Movement." This latter development is of great importance as the sign of the increasing attraction which the School is exercising upon the best brains of the younger generation, who are not ashamed to call themselves Evangelicals, but who rightly desire to keep abreast of modern thought and to interpret the old message to a new age. It is inevitable that all such fresh attempts to explain the inexplicable must cause heart-burning between Liberals—whose temptation is to rush in with ill-digested theories, and Conservatives—who are in danger of reacting so violently that they confound truth with dogma.

But Evangelicals, who are very jealous of their

Protestant heritage of private judgment, must concede that right to each other, even though it lends their party that appearance of a rope of sand which its heavenward pull upon the world utterly refutes. And if only by mutual love and forbearance they will beat down the twin devils of Scorn and Suspicion, then that Holy Spirit Who once saved the movement from wrecking upon the rock of Calvinism will hold them together over such questions as Inspiration and the two Natures of Christ.

The issue really turns upon the faithful preaching of the Cross, which is the fundamental doctrine of the movement and the power of its Evangel.

The Atonement with its unfathomable love will always offer an inexhaustible mine for scholars; but their new explanations must not explain away what Bishop Butler finds the Bible has never explained, nor evade the Saviour's own declaration that He gave His life "a ransom *instead of* many." Recently, there has been a great return to the language of "Substitution" even in Modernist quarters;¹ while it is sheer blindness to ignore the whole record of the Evangelical Movement as the living proof that the Pauline preaching of the Cross may be a stumbling-block to the formalist and folly to the philosopher, but is still the power and wisdom of God.

Meanwhile there sound to-day two challenges calling Evangelicals to unite in a common purpose.

One is from the Church. There are signs that (as once in the vital issue of Baptismal Regeneration) Evangelicals will rally as one body to maintain "the

¹ See Canon Streeter's *Reality*, pp. 231, 232, and Principal Garvie, *The Christian Doctrine of the Godhead*, p. 110.

fundamental doctrine of the Church of England " ¹—namely, "the supremacy of Holy Scripture." However they may have finally voted, they were one in a determined opposition to these portions of the Revised Prayer Book in which important doctrine could not claim the authority of God's Word written. Henceforth they will steadfastly contend that the formularies of the Church in matters of Faith and things necessary to salvation require the sanction, not merely the silence, of Scripture. If the Church ever rescinded the Sixth Article, Evangelicals would have to go; till it is rescinded the Church must not transgress it.

The other challenge comes from the nation. The Parliamentary debates upon the Prayer Book have revealed the British people not only as incorrigibly religious, but also as looking towards the Evangelical School in days when there is a real hunger and thirst after spiritual things. Who for their sakes would not consecrate himself? And yet it is very hard to be an effective Evangelical in these times.

I have already emphasized two fundamentals of the movement: its Message—the propitiation of the Cross, and its Charter—the supremacy of Holy Scripture. There is a third, its Talisman, which is Prayer. But this hectic age of rush makes it far harder "to be still," or to concentrate when still, than when our forefathers set aside three hours a day for communion with God.

This explains the modern tendency to substitute habits of sacramental devotion for "the morning watch" and "the quiet time," though it does not make more saints. But if we sons of our Evangelical

¹ Bishop Headlam, *The Church of England*, p. 48.

fathers are resolute to sacrifice all in order to preach a definite Gospel, to conduct a spiritual and Scriptural worship, and above all so to discipline ourselves in regular habits of prayer and meditation that we arrest and attract to our Lord by the holiness of our lives—then that Religious Revival, which we believe is imminent in these fateful days of world-wide renaissance, shall mean yet another Evangelical movement even greater than the last.

O God, we have heard with our ears and our fathers have declared unto us the noble works that Thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.

O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for Thine honour.

THE OXFORD MOVEMENT

BY THE REV. CANON E. G. SELWYN, D.D.

MANY attempts have been made to trace the lineage of the Oxford revival. Some have named first the Romantic Movement in literature which alike in Germany and in England marked the entry of the nineteenth century, and in the novels of Sir Walter Scott gave to the past a new glory and to the present a new hope. Others, again, have seen in it chiefly a reaction against the revolutionary tendencies in politics and thought which had been released upon Europe by Rousseau and the French Revolution. Yet others have appealed to the existence of a Catholic tradition in the English Church from the Reformation onwards, which only awaited some new inspiration to kindle it into flame. More recently, the great Swedish scholar, Dr. Brilioth, and in close agreement with him Professor Webb at Oxford, have emphasized the "moralism" of the Movement and its connection with the work of Kant. Dean Church, always the most concrete of writers, says that "it had its spring in the consciences and characters of its leaders."

There is truth in all these statements: each spring contributed its stream to the river. The influence of Romanticism is seen in the re-discovery of

the Middle Ages as full of many wholesome examples and high achievements ; in the vision of the many types of religious vocation by which men and women may serve God ; and in the awakened sensitiveness to beauty, which restored our churches and transformed our worship, not from any subjective taste or æsthetic impulse, but from a fundamental belief that God was a God of beauty and His nature belied unless this were proclaimed. "Moralism," too, there was without question ; the supremacy of conscience has never been more emphasized by word and witness than it was by the Tractarians ; and their most robust opponent, Arnold of Rugby, could not pretend that their zeal for righteousness was one whit less genuine than his own. Certainly "the characters of its leaders" were a mainspring of the movement ; the names of Pusey, Keble, Newman, will be honoured so long as our race is Christian. And yet they were never tired of saying that what they taught was not their own, but was given them from above, and given, like the prophetic messages of old, in relation to particular needs and circumstances in the Church of their day and place. It was that which made Oriel "a school of the prophets."

The fact that Anglo-Catholicism—to use a necessary, if somewhat clumsy, abbreviation—had been an integral part of the Church of England from the Reformation is important. It is not merely a question of Catholic elements in Hooker or Jewel ; nor of the peculiar charm of temper seen in George Herbert or Sir Thomas Browne or the group at Little Gidding ; nor of the steadfast witness to Catholic faith and piety of a succession of great divines and bishops,

from Laud and Andrewes in the seventeenth century to William Law and Thomas Wilson and Joseph Butler in the eighteenth. The tradition we are speaking of was no privilege of specialists ; it was the heritage of plain Church of England people. Dr. Leighton Pullan has portrayed in vivid colours the scene at the Christmas Communion in many a London church in Queen Anne's day ; and, if we are accustomed to regard the stream as showing only a very tenuous course during the eighteenth century, the massive form of Dr. Johnson comes to bid us be cautious in our judgments ; while the grooms and maid-servants in the novels of Richardson and Fielding remind us that, if the gentry had cast the practice of piety out of their parlours, it still found a warm and loving welcome in the pantry and the stable. Not less significance attaches to events in America. In 1722, the President and six of the Fellows of Yale University, all of them at that time laymen, announced that they had become convinced of the truth of the Anglican position, and founded the group known as the "New England Churchmen." Such a revolt from the Puritanism of New England was not to be lightly tolerated. The offenders were duly prosecuted ; their movement was described by Chief Justice Sewall as "the Connecticut apostasy" ; and they were all forced to resign their academic positions. But their action, anticipating in many ways later happenings at Oxford, bore rich fruit. You can still see in Trinity College, Hartford, the mitre which Bishop Seabury, the first Anglican bishop in America, wore in 1784 ; and Seabury, who taught a high doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, derived directly

from the New England Churchmen. It was his friend, T. B. Chandler, who wrote the Preface to the American Prayer Book of 1789—a book in which the liturgy was almost identical with that recently proposed in this country; and it is not without interest to find him saying in it that “it is far from the intention of this Church to depart from the Church of England in any essential point of doctrine, discipline, or worship.” It is as though the American Church had got through the throes of its Oxford Movement before ours began; and perhaps that is why the “Tracts for the Times” had a considerably larger circulation in America than in England.

If I have seemed to digress, it is because I want to bring out clearly the fact that Anglo-Catholicism had already an important place in Anglicanism long before the Oxford Movement began. This is not to detract from the lustre of the Tractarians: their work of revival remains a mighty work. The tradition was dormant, so far as the Church as a whole was concerned: Erastianism flourished, and had become a formidable vested interest; to awaken the sleeping embers was to encounter all the obstinate prejudices which cling to long-standing abuse. But it was not a new thing that was born; it was the return of something which the English Church had “loved long since and lost awhile.”

And this recovery occurred in a time of political and intellectual turmoil. The ferment of passions and ideas stirred up by the French Revolution synchronized with a vast change in industrial conditions at home which was affecting large sections of the population; new rights were being claimed

and every institution was on challenge. Reaction to such a challenge may be of two kinds : the one expressed in the Radicalism which aims at sweeping away the institution, the other in the Conservatism which aims at reforming it ; and the political history of England in the nineteenth century is largely a matter of oscillation between these two principles. The second was that expressed by the Tractarians. The Church was vulnerable to attack, they claimed, not because its principles were faulty, but because it had been unfaithful to them in practice. It was itself founded upon the rock of the Catholic Faith, a branch of the world-wide Church which derived from Christ Himself, endowed with His supernatural life, served by a Ministry which inherited His commission to the Apostles, and fed on the sacraments of His appointing. If the Church of England was challenged now, it was not for asserting these principles, but for neglecting them ; it had let the salt lose its savour, and who could wonder if the nation was on the brink of apostasy ? It was the prophetic message of Hosea, of the Deuteronomist, of Ezekiel. " Look unto the rock whence ye were hewn, and to the hole of the pit whence ye were digged. Look unto Abraham your father, and unto Sarah that bare you " (Isa. li. 1).

But, like the prophets of Israel, the Tractarians bore a message which was new as well as old. Current criticism of institutions was matched by a literary and historical criticism which searched the foundations of accepted traditions in many fields of knowledge. The sceptical spirit informing Wolf's Homeric studies in Germany and Hume's historical work in this

country could not be warned off the subject of religion ; and during the latter half of the eighteenth century Reimarus at Hamburg and Semler at Halle had made a beginning of the critical study of the Scriptures and Christian origins. The importance of these first steps lay not in their results, but in their method ; they represented the resolve to apply to Christian fact and faith the principles of scientific knowledge which were already revolutionizing man's mental map of the universe and were destined to enlarge and deepen his whole conception of reality. Could Christianity come to terms with this movement of the mind ?

Affirmative answers were given by thinkers of many schools of thought, both within and without the Church, during the nineteenth century. Within the Church of England, however, the undoubtedly important part played by Arnold of Rugby in popularizing theological liberalism has tended to obscure the extent to which the Tractarians also welcomed the new learning. As it happens, this year is the centenary of the publication of Dr. Pusey's first book. It is called *On the Theology of Germany*¹ ; and if anyone will be at pains to turn to it, he will observe the profound appreciation of recent German scholarship which inspires its pages. His attitude is far from being reactionary. What he criticizes in German Protestantism is its fixed and static quality ; and he sets against it the idea of Catholic faith and

¹ This is the title on the cover ; on the title-page it is given more fully as *An Historical Enquiry into the Probable Causes of the Rationalist Character lately predominant in the Theology of Germany*.

practice as a force essentially dynamic, and appeals to the revelation it embodies as a body of truth only to be progressively understood. It must be remembered that Pusey, and the Tractarians whom he was so soon to join, had a more difficult task than Arnold, for they were far more sensitive than he to the Church's devotional life and to the delicate ligaments which bound it to belief. Their greater sense of what had to be conserved imposed on them a greater caution. But that Pusey's attitude of 1828 was no eccentricity was shown abundantly as the Oxford Movement developed. There was something in it from the first, that is to say, which distinguished Anglican from Roman Catholicism, a liberal element that was prepared to give full weight to Criticism, and refused either to go to sleep on ancient formularies or to translate pious opinions into dogmas of the Faith. It appeared later, somewhat to the discomfiture of his new friends, in Newman's *Essay on Development*; it inspired the sober pragmatism of Dean Church; and through the teaching of the *Lux Mundi* school it has passed to our own generation. If its face has changed, it is because problems have changed. Astronomy and physics have unveiled for us a new universe; the Higher Criticism is less pressing than Comparative Religion and Psychology in imposing the issues of apologetic; and Professor Hobson and Dr. Whitehead, rather than T. H. Green, are providing the atmosphere in which Christian philosophy must function.

A distinction has sometimes been drawn between the Oxford Movement proper, which may be said

to have ended with Newman's secession, and the Ritualist movement—again I use a convenient, though, indeed, misleading phrase—which translated its message into work and worship in the towns and villages of England. But the distinction is superficial only, and due mainly to the different circumstances and interests of the men concerned. The Tractarians were essentially academic and theological. They appealed to Catholic antiquity for authority and precedent, and maintained that sound learning showed the Church of England, as judged by its official formularies, to be a true national branch of the Church Catholic; and they claimed that the whole Church should, if consistent with itself, conform to its own standards so interpreted. The Ritualists, on the other hand, were practical parish priests, many of them living in the dingiest slums and surrounded by a population heathen in everything but name. The Church's national character appealed far less to them than its pastoral and missionary vocation, and they had no objection to borrowing from the Church of the Counter-Reformation methods and manners which had proved of value elsewhere. But they were not disloyal. If they were trying to turn the Church of England into something it was not, they were only doing what idealists were bound to do; and their ideals, unlike those of W. G. Ward, were Anglican, not Roman. Tractarians and Ritualists represented two sides of one movement, and Pusey and Keble were the leaders of both.

The truth is that both groups were actuated by the same governing vision and idea. It was the vision of that City whose builder and maker is God,

the one organic Church, which was the very Body of Christ, the witness to His truth, the steward of His grace, and the home of His Spirit. In the Universities, and among the learned generally, interest was required to centre upon its historical foundations, its continuity in sound teaching and holy living with the Church of the Fathers, and especially upon the claim of the Church of England to be the lawful heir in this country of the ancient and undivided Church. But among the clergy and in the Church at large this appeal to antiquity was enriched and warmed by another—by the appeal, or at least the conscious reference, to the experience of the contemporary Church elsewhere. After all, Catholicism was not only ancient, it was living; and its responses to the movements of God's Spirit were not the less genuine because they were not coined in our mint. So it came about that some of the best elements of the Western Church were transplanted into the soil of Anglicanism. Retreats, Quiet Days, the practice of Meditation, the use of Manuals of Devotion, the Three Hours' Service on Good Friday—these were a few of the borrowings from contemporary religion outside our borders. Their widespread acceptance showed that human nature and its needs were much the same in England as in Germany or France. Transplanted to our soil, they have also adapted themselves to our climate and are used without controversy or cavil. May we not say that, when regarded in that light, present issues like that of the Reserved Sacrament lose much of their terrors? And in this case we have generations of purely Anglican experience to profit by: no

question arises of crossing the English Channel ; we have only to look across the Tweed.

Nearly a century has elapsed since Keble sounded the *reveillé* in the pulpit of St. Mary's at Oxford. In the interval the Catholic movement has passed through many vicissitudes ; has experienced countless disappointments, checks, rebuffs, seeming betrayals ; has suffered from the mistakes of friends as well as from the prejudices of foes. Can we estimate its place in the life of our Church and nation ?

Perhaps the most marked characteristic of Anglo-Catholicism has been its unvarying witness to Christianity as a supernatural religion—as a divine invasion, that is to say, into history and human life in judgment, pardon, and grace. This is the element in religion which has been finding prophetic voices in our time, such as those of von Hügel in England, Maritain in France, Karl Barth in Protestant Germany ; and the immense influence of these writers is the sign that it has touched some great need in Christendom. It makes much of the transcendence and prevenience of God ; of the Bible as His Word of Revelation ; of Christ as the One Mediator and the Church as His Body ; of miracle and sacrament ; of the heavenly fellowship with the Saints. It is this conviction of God as the living God, active now in this world of ours, casting down and raising up, which has been the dominant note of its theology ; has borne fruit in countless vocations to forsake all for Christ in the religious life ; and underlies to-day the earnest demand for the Reservation of the Sacrament. And such a cause can no more be popular to-day than it was in the first two centuries of our era.

The Gospel of God's grace cuts far too clean across the presuppositions of our easy-going life, challenges too bluntly our optimisms, searches the heart too deeply ever to be popular. The nation is a natural unit and must savour the things of man; the Church is supernatural and must savour the things of God. It is not because the nation has degenerated, but because the Church has re-discovered her soul, that a revision of the terms of partnership between Church and State has become both necessary and natural.

Once more. Anglo-Catholicism bears witness to Christianity as not only supernatural, but also, and for that very reason, supra-national. Patriotic to the core, it yet has always in mind the immortal motto, "Patriotism is not enough." It embraces joyfully the vision of the Church imposed upon us by sister and daughter Churches overseas, and longs for the day when the whole family shall again be visibly one. That is why it is critical of any prospects of Reunion which envisage only the English field: they may do little more than enhance an already too great insularity. It is significant that in France and Belgium, in Sweden and Germany, and in Eastern Europe, Catholic and Protestant theologians are watching the progress of Anglo-Catholicism with interest, and sometimes even with enthusiasm. For the movement is felt to have something to contribute, not only to England or the Anglo-Saxon race, but to Christendom and the world.

What, then, of the future? It would be foolish to predict in a matter where the Spirit alone can lead. But some lessons are too plain to be ignored.

First of all, let it be said that Anglo-Catholicism stands or falls with its fidelity to what is liberal no less than to what is Catholic in its principles. Secondly, the long habit of controversy, and still more of schism, has done its devastating work, and the majority of our countrymen, who seventy years ago were still a church-going people, have to-day forsaken the practice of religion and drifted into secularism. And yet England is rarely secular for long ; and beneath the surface there are stirring desires and gropings after some ampler fellowship which shall attest its authority by its own rich and many-sided concord. Can the Church of England rise to the measure of that opportunity ? The answer will depend on the thoroughness with which it succeeds in exorcizing that spirit of suspicion which has so often led to persecution, calumny and repression on one side, and to defiance, partisanship and narrowness on the other. For its own part, Anglo-Catholicism claims of the Church's authorities—and indeed also of public opinion—full, frank, and generous recognition of its place in the national life, and scope for the exercise of its principles in the Church without charges of disloyalty. In such an atmosphere questions of discipline would quickly recede ; a halt would be called to individual eccentricities which no responsible Anglo-Catholic opinion defends ; and the Church would be enabled, by the testimony of its own interior peace and self-discipline, at once corporate and individual, to bring home to the dullest conscience the true ends of human life, and reveal the majesty and the loving-kindness of the Lord.

THE CHRISTIAN SOCIAL MOVEMENT

BY THE BISHOP OF WOOLWICH

WE have to go back a very long time to discover the origin of what is now known as "the Christian Social Movement." There has always been a tendency in human minds to separate the different concerns of life into water-tight compartments, and to say that there are affairs with which religion has no concern. "Business is business and religion is religion, and you must keep the two apart," is a popular conception.

Such teachers say that the laws relating to material life, as physics, chemistry and economics, are rigid and inevitable, and in these spheres the religious principles of faith, hope and love can have no place.

Such a theory may bring some relief to minds perplexed by social suffering.

For these sufferings they can find no solution, and so seek refuge in the conviction that such results are brought about by inflexible laws over which human wills have no control. Consequently, human destinies must be ground out under the influence of an iron necessity which feels no pity, and for which we are not responsible and cannot change. But the minds of religious men in every age have risen in revolt against this fatalism.

Chemistry and physics deal with the inanimate things of material nature, which remain the same from age to age. But, on the other hand, economics deal with living human beings, pulsating with emotions of sympathy and love; and these conditions, involving human life and happiness, cannot be tied down by iron laws.

Human relations change from age to age; new discoveries, new civilizations, create new conditions. The cruel sufferings in our social order are *not* caused by inevitable natural laws, but by human thoughtlessness and greed.

Consequently, divine love and sympathy can transform these evil conditions and ameliorate unnecessary suffering.

Among the Jews material prosperity was regarded as a sign of divine approval—"the righteous shall not lack anything that is good"; while suffering and want were regarded as God's method to punish evil-doers.

But the later prophets had no sympathy with this rough and ready-made philosophy.

They denounced the greed of the selfish rich as causing poverty and suffering. "Woe unto them that join house to house and lay field to field." "What mean ye that ye crush My people, and grind the faces of the poor?" They demand a new spirit and a new standard of social duty. "Let judgment run down like waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." "What doth Jehovah require of thee save doing judgment and loving mercy and walking humbly with Thy God?"

In all this the prophets were preparing for the coming of our Lord with His new Way of Life.

The very heart of Christ's teaching is revealed in that striking saying, repeated on four several occasions, with slightly varying emphasis :

“He that seeketh gain in life, loses life ; and he that is willing to lose will save his life alive.”

Herein lies the secret of our Lord's life ; He has proved its truth by His example, a truth which commends itself to the best conscience of men.

The Fatherhood of God, into which we are called, carries with it the corresponding obligation of the brotherhood of men ; we are members of one family, and no man lives for himself. Service, not gain, is the law by which we live. The good we receive we share with others, and we recognize the divine obligation of allowing to all an equal opportunity of making the best of that life which God has given to all for the service of our fellow-men.

This teaching of the Sermon on the Mounts needs a literal interpretation and a universal application.

We find it wonderfully illustrated in the Church of the first centuries ; never was there a religion less individualistic. Devotion to the teaching of our Lord found expression in a life of unselfish service ; from everyone according to his power, to everyone according to his need. It was essentially a religion of fellowship, and turned existing standards upside down. Christianity was persecuted and unpopular with those in power, but its moral standard was very high. Then followed the conversion of Constantine, and Christianity became a State religion. It was safe, nay, it was the direct road to Court favour ; thousands embraced it, and the moral standard came down with a run. But still through all the ages the

moral witness of Christianity has never quite been silenced.

The idea of a life of service and fellowship was manifest in monastic institutions, a society in the world, but not of the world.

In the Renaissance the schoolmen reveal a high conception of social duty. In this all men are equal, and share alike in the gifts of God. No man has a right to exploit another to his own advantage. The law of Christ is the foundation on which man's whole life, social and individual, was built.

The Christian Church did endeavour at this time to regulate buying and selling and to prohibit usury.

Our own Bishop Latimer was an ardent preacher of social righteousness.

But the rise of large-scale industry, which was the beginning of modern capitalism, threatened these Christian ideals. In England especially the new industrialism, wholly emancipated from religion, found its basis in a positively anti-Christian philosophy.

The application of steam-power to mill, factory and mine 150 years ago revolutionized industry.

The benefits which accrued to mankind are manifest. A higher standard of living has become available for all, wider opportunities of education are being evolved, distant nations are being brought nearer to one another to share in a common civilization.

But at the same time we cannot fail to see that the actual development of our present industrial system has had disastrous effects.

The material things produced were deemed of greater value than the workers, and the acquisition of gain was the dominant factor in the industrial world.

There is no need now to recite the horrors which were then prevalent in factory and mine, they are universally condemned to-day ; but the significant point is that they were justified at the time on economic grounds.

The Planters urged that the emancipation of slaves would undermine the prosperity of the West Indies, and the mill-owners prophesied the ruin of the cotton industry if child-labour was abolished ; while the aggrandisement of wealth due to the increased value of ground rents, mining royalties and monopoly profits for personal gain were universally defended.

The exercise of right was fiercely maintained—"May I not do what I like with my own ?"—and under its influence men grew powerful, selfish and rich, for "acquisitiveness creates riches and destroys morals." But in spite of this the Christian conscience in the land became articulate. Ruskin and Carlyle spoke as Christian prophets.

In 1929 Michael Sadler, M.P. for Newark, brought in the first Factory Bill in the House of Commons. He lost his seat in 1832, and died shortly afterwards.

Then Anthony Ashley Cooper, afterwards Lord Shaftesbury, came forward as the leader of the Labour Movement. In him we have a strange combination. An aristocrat and a Tory, hostile to universal suffrage and to Trades Unions, with a horror for all violence, whether in speech or action ; but he was a Christian to the core, and claimed that Christ's principles should govern every department of human life. He held that the conditions in mill and mine were repug-

nant to the will of God, and must be completely changed.

He ploughed a lone furrow.

Distrusted by his friends, disowned by his father, he was opposed alike by owners, statesmen, political economists and the leaders of the Church ; the workers knew it and have remembered it.

But we are glad that one clergyman stood by him, the Rev. O. S. Bull, the Vicar of Brierley, near Bradford.

Shaftesbury carried through his first Factory Bill in 1833 and his first Bill to reform conditions in mines in 1842. He further sought to remedy the sufferings of the agricultural labourers in their work and in their homes ; and all this in the face of fierce opposition.

We have an instance of the strange perversity of human nature at this time in the inconsistent action of William Wilberforce. He was an impassioned advocate for the abolition of the slave traffic overseas, but he had not the same sympathy for those suffering from economic conditions at home, but actually wrote to say that they should bear patiently their privations now, because these would enable them the more to enjoy the pleasures of heaven hereafter.¹

While Lord Shaftesbury was carrying on his political work there grew up a new School in the Church of England which sought to transform the modern industrial system by the power of the Spirit of Christ.

¹ See *Practical View of the System of Christianity*, by Wm. Wilberforce (1798).

One of the earliest teachers in this school was Frederick Denison Maurice. He believed the Church was a spiritual constitution designed to maintain both the human and divine relationship. He had a deep sympathy with the Chartist movement, and became a leader in what was then known as "Christian Socialism." He maintained that it is false to say that competition is the law of the Universe, for you cannot get the best out of any man by appealing to his worst motives of cupidity and greed. He deprecated all strife between labour and capital, and claimed that the performance of Christian duties between man and man was the true basis of Society.

Maurice met with strenuous opposition in the religious Press and elsewhere. He inaugurated colleges for working men, and his spiritual influence gave a great impetus to the new movement. Closely associated with Maurice from 1844 was Charles Kingsley, who by his preaching, and more especially by his writing, fostered the social application of Christianity.

But greater than either of these in intellect and spiritual influence was Brooke Foss Westcott. He was a scholar of European reputation and possessed an intense personal magnetism. A prophet with a wide spiritual vision and a deep humility; "The confidence and self-assertion of men frightens me," he used to say.

He strove to interpret all life in the light of the Incarnation. The Christian life must answer to the Christian faith. "As a Christian I must bring every interest of man within the range of my religion." "If the Word became flesh the brotherhood of man

is a reality, and this foundation is able to support the fabric, which answers to the present needs of Society."

He strove for a realization of the Christian ideal in the family, in the nation, and in all international relations.

In Christ all men are brothers; we are bound together by ties which man did not invent and which man cannot destroy; and men grow stronger through self-sacrifice than through self-assertion.

Westcott was one of the founders of "the Christian Social Union," which came into existence to promote the study of all social problems in the light of Christianity. These were three great pioneers in the Christian Social Movement of the past generation:

Maurice—a profound thinker—deep and far-seeing.

Kingsley—a brilliant genius, interpreting by poetry and story.

Westcott—a sound theologian and scholar, humble, devout, spiritual.

But this, as I have striven to show, is no new movement. We are inheritors of a glorious past; we have inherited blessings far exceeding our achievements.

Through prophets, apostles, and the theologians of all time, we learn to interpret the principles of the everlasting Gospel to meet the needs of each changing age.

During the present century since Westcott's death the work has been carried on by such teachers as Henry Scott Holland and Charles Gore, who, thank God, is with us still, and others too many to name.

This social application of Christianity has penetrated our English Communion throughout the world, and in it we see the hope of a solution of our social, industrial and international problems: its adherents are not attached to any one political party, nor do they advocate any special economic system.

But we believe that this movement has borne good fruit. We see it in the improved conditions of labour, the shortened hours and the increased wages.

We see it in the widespread anxiety to remove slums and improve the homes of the workers.

We see it in the better relations that exist in many industries between employers and employed.

We see it in the better care for the welfare of children and the training of adolescents.

We see it in the evergrowing desire for peace.

We see these things on every hand and we thank God and take courage.

But the work is not yet done; in some instances it seems scarcely to have begun. We need a new spirit which demands for all a rightful share of God's blessing for the life that now is as well as for that which is to come—not as a matter of charity, but as of right and Christian justice.

In conclusion, may I paraphrase four propositions enunciated by Bishop Gore in the Halley Stewart Lectures, 1927, which challenge the attention of the Christian Church to-day.

I

We are profoundly discontented with the present conditions of society in industry and international

relations as evidenced by unemployment, poverty, overcrowding and national jealousies, maintained and upheld by a capitalist system.

We demand a reform thorough and sincere; and are convinced that such reform can never be achieved by hatred and class struggle, but only by sympathy, goodwill and love.

II

That we will not be put off merely by an appeal to the inexorable laws of political economy, because these evils are caused by human blindness, wilfulness, avarice and selfishness over the widest scale.

Reform will be achieved not only by legislative action, but by a fundamental change of spirit, a great act of Repentance, so as to inaugurate the rule of the Kingdom of God into all departments of human life.

III

That this change of spirit will not come by a simultaneous conversion of men on a wide scale, but by a more gradual process, as is evidenced in the evolution of human history. Consequently those who are possessed of this conviction must be prepared to work and suffer together till the vision be realized in the world at large.

IV

That Jesus Christ is the one Redeemer of men, in social as well as in individual life, in this present world as well as in that which is to come. Therefore all who believe in Him and His Kingdom must be prepared to co-operate with Him here and now to

establish His supremacy over all men, under all conditions.

“Christ must be Lord of all if He is to be Lord at all.”

You have heard this afternoon of the growth of three great movements in our English Communion—the Evangelical, the Catholic, the Modernist. May we not claim that this, the Christian Social Movement, combines the very best elements of all three: the practical application of our common Christianity to all the concerns of our daily life.

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION
OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY THE REV. CANON O. C. QUICK, CANON OF CARLISLE

IT is evident on reflection that the most difficult problems in the general interpretation of the Christian faith spring from the fact that the faith itself consists of two opposed elements. On the one hand, Christians are committed to a belief in a final revelation of God which took place once for all at a certain time and place in the historical events which the New Testament records. On the other hand, they are no less committed to belief in a continuous revelation of God through the Holy Spirit Who guides them progressively into all the truth and unites revelation with discovery.

It is easy to see how liable are these two elements of the faith to be brought into conflict with one another, and how a too exclusive stress upon either part may disturb the balance of the whole. Suppose we emphasize the finality of what was revealed in the life and death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. At once it seems that the main task of Christian faith is to keep pure, unchanged and undefiled the truth which was then once for all committed to the stewardship of men. It must be handed on down the centuries without loss and without accretion.

A loyal safeguarding of the tradition becomes the main object of the Church's life, a humble acceptance of it the first duty of the individual Christian. The truth is what was originally given; the new is perforce identified with the false. To be faithful means not so much to be trustful as to be trustworthy, to abide in the appointed place rather than to embark on new ventures. The Christian is one who waits in a besieged city for the coming of his Lord; and the work of the Holy Spirit is rather to help him to resist the wiles of error which would lure him from his fortifications, than to lead him into any exploration of fresh ground or on any forlorn hope for the conquest of the world.

But then consider Christianity from the opposite point of view. Christ's earthly life is but the inauguration of the full activity of the Spirit in the hearts and minds of believers. The Church has set forth upon an age-long quest and venture under His guidance. There is no better description of its life under this aspect than that contained in the memorable words of Newman: "It is sometimes said that the stream is clearest near the spring. Whatever use may fairly be made of this image, it does not apply to the history of a philosophy or a belief, which on the contrary is more equable and purer and stronger when its bed has become deep and broad and full. It necessarily rises out of an existing state of things, and for a time savours of the soil. Its vital element needs disengaging from what is foreign and temporary, and is employed in efforts after freedom which become more vigorous and hopeful as its years increase. Its beginnings

are no measure of its capabilities, nor of its scope. At first no one knows what it is, or what it is worth. It remains perhaps for a time quiescent ; it tries as it were, its limbs and proves the ground under it, and feels its way. From time to time it makes essays which fail and are in consequence abandoned. It seems in suspense which way to go ; it wavers and at length strikes out in one definite direction. In time it enters upon strange territory ; points of controversy alter their bearing ; parties rise and fall around it ; dangers and hopes appear in new relations ; and old principles reappear in new forms. It changes with them in order to remain the same. In a higher world it is otherwise ; but here below to live is to change, and to be perfect is to have changed often." Consider the different order of values suggested by this picture. Faith is the willingness to follow a living Guide into the unknown. Truth itself means not so much the finally revealed reality of things as the spirit of hopeful and arduous exploration. The image of the Christian waiting and watching in his citadel is changed into that of the Christian pressing on toward the mark and forgetting the things that are behind.

Now, in thus sharply defining the antithesis between two elements in the Christian religion, we have not been opposing what is characteristically Catholic to what is characteristically Protestant, but rather what is characteristically mediaeval (and also pre- and post-mediaeval) to what is characteristically modern. Mediaeval Christianity was on the whole a religion of safeguarding and defence. The Protestant Re-

formers, though they rejected much of what they considered a corrupt tradition, were primarily concerned nevertheless to find a stronger and more surely based security of salvation by a return to an older and purer Gospel. They also, like their Catholic opponents, were more desirous to found spiritual safety upon an ancient truth than to find spiritual salvation through fresh discoveries. The attempt to baptize into Christianity the spirit of intellectual quest and venture is a movement which had its origin in the last century. And one of its first prophets ended his earthly pilgrimage in communion with the Church of Rome. In fact, the tremendous change in human thinking wrought by the great body of scientific doctrine vaguely known as "evolution" has had its influence upon every religious authority in Christendom, and at first it met with no less determined opposition from the Protestant, who maintained the Bible as the only rule of faith, than from the Catholic, who added to the Bible the tradition infallibly defined from the Chair of St. Peter.

Nevertheless, in Western Europe of the twentieth century it is more and more evident that the Vatican stands out as the champion of the defensive religion which safeguards the truth revealed in the past, while many of the Evangelical Churches seem to have found in doctrines of evolution an occasion for a fresh rendering of Christian truth for which Newman's dictum, that here below to live is to change, provides an apt but seldom acknowledged motto.

Roman Catholic orthodoxy admits development of doctrine only in a dialectical and deductive sense.

The whole content of the faith was once for all delivered to the apostles. But not all the intellectual implications of that faith, nor all the certain deductions to be made from it, were immediately rendered evident. This task of explication and deduction is progressively performed in the life of the Church down the centuries. But it can only be the explication of what faithful Christians have always really believed from the beginning. When such an explication of any doctrinal point has become manifest in the consciousness of the Church, it is the duty of the Pope under the Holy Spirit's guidance to set the seal of his infallible authority upon it. In this way the area of truth which the wall of infallibility secures is from time to time extended, and no inch of the ground which has once come within its protection can ever conceivably be given up. Thus, as the centuries pass, the content of the Christian faith, which has been believed *semper ubique et ab omnibus*, comes to be more exactly, completely and stringently formulated in a growing number of infallible propositions which every faithful Christian is bound to accept. The Holy Spirit's guidance of the Church into all the truth is found precisely in the formulation of these binding propositions. And thus the very faith in the Spirit, on which the modern mind seizes as giving the Christian his charter of intellectual freedom and right of critical inquiry into truths new and old, is understood by Rome as tying the mind more securely to an ever-increasing weight of tradition. Too often, in the result, the young champion of the Lord's host against the Goliath of unbelief appears

to move uneasily in a clanking panoply of inherited dogma which, even if, unlike David, he claims to have proved it all, nevertheless sorely hampers his power of attack.

Meanwhile, on the left wing of Christian theology there are many who hesitate to affirm any finality of revelation in the past, lest the freedom of spiritual growth and movement be confined thereby. They would indeed affirm the spiritual continuity of the Christian Gospel down the centuries ; for continuity is postulated by the very idea of growth. But the unity which depends on such continuity cannot be found in any definable and unchanging substratum which underlies all the theologies of successive generations. The whole organism of the faith must inevitably be modified by every development which it undergoes. Even the Creeds themselves, nay, even the New Testament on which the Creeds are based, could only convey to one particular age a truth which other ages must express differently, each in its own characteristic forms of thought and language. No doubt there is a unity of spiritual experience running through all the different phases of historical Christianity. But such a unity defies formulation. And to speak of a final revelation, though in a certain sense justifiable, is generally misleading. No truth has been revealed until it has been expressed ; and expression must be in terms of the particular age, and therefore cannot be final. Our Lord Himself spoke on earth as a Jew of the first century. But now we must know Him no more after the flesh.

Thus we easily reach the conclusion that the only final and absolute dogma is that of the relativity of

truth. Of the strength and authority of this dogma there is no need to remind any modern audience. Yet its commonest fruit would appear to be a profound sense of spiritual insecurity, which, far from driving us to new ventures in the power of the Spirit, is making us in the sphere of practical religion considerably more cautious than our fathers. There is no more remarkable or disquieting contrast in the modern world than that between the willingness of the rising generation to risk life and limb in heroic adventures of exploration above the clouds and beneath the sea, and its comparative indifference to the oft-repeated call to venture and sacrifice for Christ. Is it simply that parsons are too patient, or orthodoxy too correct? Or is it that adventure for the Kingdom of God can only be inspired by a certainty of inward conviction which the whirl of modern discoveries has for the time being weakened and confused? It does not seem to be true in experience that to relax authority and to pronounce finality a dream is enough in itself to produce fresh vigour of spiritual life. For all our aeroplanes and submarines, perhaps we shall never really find courage to take the wings of God's spiritual morning, or dwell in the uttermost parts of His sea, until we believe that even there also shall His hand lead us and His right hand hold us. It is when we believe once more that God for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, that we shall be willing to risk and suffer, not only in order to drive our engines farther and faster into the void, but in order to make known to men the message of His love.

If that be so, there may still be room in Christen-

dom for a method of interpreting the Christian faith as a whole, which may be said to be the ideal of the Anglican Church, however imperfectly the ideal has been expressed in action. True Anglicanism has always abhorred the doctrine of an infallible Church. It has never believed that the content of revelation could ever be formulated in any series of irreformable propositions. The VIIIth Article declares that the Creeds are authoritative as proved by Scripture; but it is idle to deny that the ultimate authority of Scripture itself is otherwise conceived by modern theologians than it was by those of the sixteenth century. There is no infallible document. We cannot pretend that even our XXXIX Articles are verbally inspired.

But though there be no infallibility in documents, there may be finality in a life, if that life itself be not only a fact of history, but also an act of God in which He has once for all expressed His nature through the nature of man. This is no place to expound or justify the great doctrines of the Incarnation and Atonement. But for us those doctrines have final and absolute worth, not as philosophical statements nor as verbally inerrant formulations, but rather as imperfect presentations in word of what God through Jesus Christ in fact has done. The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds are both profoundly true to the New Testament and true in themselves for all time, precisely because their statement of the faith lays all its emphasis on the great evangelical facts of what in Bethlehem, Galilee and Jerusalem God through Christ has accomplished for the salvation and healing of mankind. It is simply a mistake to say that these

Creeds translate the Gospel into the language of Hellenic or any other philosophy. With the exception of the one term, 'homoöusion, they do not really use the distinctive language or categories of philosophy at all. And just for that reason very little of them ever sounds really out of date except to highly sophisticated ears, though we have no wish to shirk the fact that such notions as those of descent into Hell and bodily resurrection must to-day receive interpretations considerably different from that which most Christians have attached to them in bygone years. For us the final revelation in past history is the life of Jesus Christ alone. And it is the continued and continual immanence of that personal life through the Spirit in the hearts and minds of believers which day by day and century after century inspires men with the courage of faith in Christ to translate into every conceivable variation of setting and circumstance His one eternal gospel of victory through the sacrifice of love. "We know that the Son of God hath come, and hath given us an understanding to acknowledge Him that is true. And we are in Him that is true, even in His Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life."

We believe that we have only to look into the content of God's final revelation of Himself through Jesus Christ in order to find reconciled in principle all those perplexing antitheses between tradition and originality, authority and freedom, objective and subjective, outward and inward, which so grievously disturb the modern mind. For the first, final and unchanging tradition of Christianity is this, that the Kingdom of God is won through

union with the life which dared to die in sacrifice upon the Cross. The original tradition itself has originality of venture at its heart. And it must be loyally interpreted no less through the intellectual self-denial, which unswervingly studies all the facts of God's world without fear or favour, than through more strictly ethical or ascetic forms of unselfishness. The Christian faith can never be kept whole and undefiled by being protected from criticism. Our beliefs are precious talents which at all costs must remain in circulation. Yet the very ground of our obligation to be open-minded towards all truth is our faith that He Who never shirked unpleasant facts, and still believed unto death, is indeed the eternal Son of the Father of all.

The ideal of the Anglican Church is to hold fast the central tradition of the faith, and therefore to welcome all diversities of interpretation which spring from the manifold operation of the One Spirit. We deliberately desire to retain in our fellowship those who keep the Cross in the centre of worship by investing with every solemnity of ritual the sacramental presentation of the one sacrifice before God, no less than those who emphasize rather the individual experience of the Christian heart, or those again who would bid us take full account of all new knowledge of the world which God's Spirit imparts to the human mind by channels other than religious. We refuse to believe that the essential principles of Catholicism, Evangelicalism and Modernism are really incompatible, since each can appeal to one aspect of the mind of Christ as the New Testament reveals it. It is true that our present divisions advertise the imperfection

of the fellowship which we have so far achieved. But what has once been joined in Christ, His Church need not set asunder. In that faith and hope Anglican bridge-builders will persevere.

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY THE REV. CANON H. A. WILSON, RECTOR OF
CHELTENHAM

WHEN Archbishop Benson visited Ireland in 1896 to greet the Church of Ireland he saw a device which described that Church as “Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed and Protestant.” In his address the Archbishop said that “there was not one of those words which could be spared” in describing the position of the Anglican Church.

Those four words express concisely that sensible balance between loyalty to the past and sincerity to the present which make up the normal British mind. The soliloquy of “Private Willis” in *Iolanthe* is, no doubt, true :

“Every boy and every gal
That’s born into this world alive
Is either a little Liberal
Or else a little Conservative.”

But it must be added that among us the normal conservatism has always a liberal sympathy and the normal liberalism has always a conservative restraint. We are not as a nation either rigidly logical or ruthlessly consistent, for there is a curious ingredient in our national character which is peculiar to ourselves. We have no elegant word for it : we call it “sports-

manship." It is the quality which in religion or politics tempers our ferocity with the reflection that perhaps the other fellow may have a good deal to say for himself. Consequently the Church of England, Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant, is peculiarly adapted to satisfy the genius of the people of England.

I do not propose to discuss the significance of all these four great words; I would only say that it is just because our "City" thus "lieth foursquare" that many of us are able to say from our hearts "the lot is fallen unto me in a fair ground, I have a goodly heritage." The fourfold emphasis must be retained if the Anglican interpretation of the Christian Faith is to be truly expressed.

My purpose, at the moment, is simply to attempt to draw out the significance of one of those words. The word "reformed" takes for granted the right of a Church to claim autonomy and self-expression; the right to claim a distinctive doctrinal position; the right to review the past and to correct mistakes; the right to what is popularly called full self-determination; and on the other hand it implies the repudiation of the theory that the Church is bound by the chains of the past, whether they were forged by other larger Churches or even by General Councils. Once a Church claims the right to reform, it has established a claim to be not merely an institution for recording and witnessing to the decisions of the past, but a living organism reshaping itself and adapting itself to a changing environment.

Clearly this is a thorny and difficult path to take, but the Church of England, by admitting the legi-

timacy of reform, had the courage to take it. "General Councils may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining to God." The Churches of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and Rome have "erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of faith." Those are two of the daring statements the Anglican Church made at the Reformation. It is impossible for us to estimate the courage needed to make such a breach with current tradition and to declare that ancient decrees might be wrong, and that contemporary judgment was entitled to review and to correct them. But this inevitable deduction from the recognition of the right to reform is the charter of all liberal thinking. That rather over-worked text, "the faith once for all delivered to the Saints," must not be called in to suggest that "God has said it all" and that the Church is, as it were, luxuriating eternally in the Upper Sixth with nothing more to learn and nothing left to unlearn.

According to the principle underlying the right of reform, it cannot be said at any time "*Ecclesia locuta est, causa finita.*" Each generation can claim the right to examine, to correct, to modify and to discard, for once you have allowed the right of reform to *any* generation, you have allowed that right to *every* generation. It is because all this lies inevitably behind the admission of the right of a Church to reform itself that it seems to me that the common expression "reformation settlement" is peculiarly unhappy. The "Reformation Unsettlement" is much more true, both to history and to the nature of real religion. The word 'settlement' suggests quiescence, the

suppression of activity, and just because the Reformation was a religious resurrection "reformation settlement" strikes me as most misleading. Religion is a living thing and "religious settlement" is as patent a contradiction as "motionless life." Religion is always and inevitably an active and disturbing force: even its doubtful ally, theology, is not capable of settlement, for as Bishop Westcott most truly said: "No formula which expresses clearly the thought of one generation can convey the same meaning to the generation that follows." Religion questions can only be "settled" by death, and death transforms them into superstition.

Dryden's reference to the Church of England was intended to contrast us favourably with other reformed Churches:

"Least deformed, because reformed the least."

But it is not a question of greater or less reform. Once the principle of reform is allowed the embankment is broken down: religious thought ceases to be a pond and becomes a running stream.

It is only a Church which takes this view of Christianity which is ever capable of becoming a comprehensive Church. Generations passed before the Church of England grasped the logical outcome of the Reformation. The mismanagement of the Puritans; the bungle which converted Nonconformist Churchmen into Dissenters; the persecution of the Methodists and the cold-shouldering of the Evangelicals were all relics of the "walled-enclosure view" of the Church. Public opinion would hardly allow resort to the stake, so nose-slitting, ear-crop-

ping, the bludgeon and the gag were employed as the best substitutes available for dealing with a prophet or a man of independent mind. But the last few generations have seen that we are at least beginning to read our roll of destiny aright. Intolerance remains now as the luxury of a few hot gossellers and we are coming into our own as a comprehensive Church. Macaulay's terrific arraignment of the Church for its lack of sympathy with its prophets and teachers was written in 1840. It could not be repeated with truth to-day. We do not slay our prophets to-day, although we do not, I fear, always listen to them. Many ancient heretics, such as Origen, Montanus and Nestorius, are recognized as religious pioneers who have made a real contribution to religious thought. Our own Communion has only produced one really first-class heretic. Pelagius was an Irishman, though it is an odd reflexion that it should be an Irishman of all people who denied the existence of original sin ! But to-day an Oxford Divinity Professor can safely toss a kindly word to him.

This comprehension is not attributable to a weak sense of truth but rather to a proper appreciation of its immensity. It is only individuals or Churches who have a defective idea of what Divine Truth means who can claim to know it all. Such a mental attitude is characteristic of immaturity or senility. The admission of the legitimacy of reform has made it possible for the Anglican Church to become comprehensive. No doubt the hostile critic would answer that it has meant the nourishing of strange and even contradictory types. Quite true, but diversity is a sign of life. Nay, more, these divergences from the norm

are really the people that matter most. Comprehension has brought into being many mongrel Churchmen, for Anglo-Catholics, Evangelicals, Modernists, are all mongrels; but as is well known, mongrels are always more interesting than thoroughbreds and generally more intelligent!

It would, however, be a complete misunderstanding of the Anglican Interpretation of the Faith to emphasize this side only. The Church of England did not throw the whole of Christianity in the melting-pot and leave everything undetermined. Article VI is not a mere isolated statement on the authority of the Bible, but again and again "Christ's ordinance," the ordinance of "God's Word," the "warranty of Scripture," are advanced as the final authority in all things pertaining to Salvation. What the Bible teaches must be faithfully taught and what is contrary to plain Scriptural teaching is forbidden. Of course this is a very different matter, as every student of the Puritan controversy knows, from maintaining that nothing may be done or taught which has not positive Scriptural authority. We do many such things. There is no plain text which sanctions the attendance of women at Holy Communion or the observance of Sunday in place of the Sabbath: Scriptural authority for Monarchical Episcopacy or Infant Baptism is distinctly open to challenge. The Church of England is satisfied to declare that nothing contrary to Scripture is allowable, and nothing is to be required as necessary to Salvation which cannot be based on Scripture.

In establishing this fixed point Anglicanism has supplied a solidity and stability to its position which

is not only unshakable, but which finds a singular and characteristic approval in the national mind. The Bible is not in this generation as widely read as it was ; but despite this lamentable fact, the belief in the authority of the Bible is so engrained in the very marrow of the nation that no presentation of Christianity which cannot stand foursquare before this test will ever stand a chance of acceptance in the general life of the nation.

When Scripture has spoken clearly the matter is finally settled, and nothing which cannot be proved from Scripture must be taught as essential truth. In regard to all questions outside that area the Anglican Church exhibits a remarkable restraint or a discreet silence.

Whatever opinion may be held as to the cause of this discretion, no one can deny that this economy in definition has been an inestimable blessing. Picture the situation to-day if we had hanging around our necks a collection of mediæval millstones in the shape of precise definitions of matters upon which new light and new truth have been shed by modern scholarship !

A sixteenth-century definition of the Inspiration of Scripture would have tied us down to-day to the alternative of obscurantism or dishonest evasion in the interpretation of the Bible. But the divinely guided ambiguity of our formularies on this point leaves the door open to honest acceptance of pretty thorough-going Biblical Criticism, and also leaves standing-ground for the traditionalist. And who would wish it otherwise ?

A sixteenth-century definition of Baptismal Re-

generation would probably have made the Anglican Church to-day impossible for Evangelicals and Modernists, just as a sixteenth-century definition of the nature of Christ's Presence in the Holy Communion would have served the same purpose for even moderate High Churchmen of the present time.

Or consider for a moment the question of Church Government. No one can study the teaching and practice of our Church during the formative period of the Book of Common Prayer without being struck by the caution and restraint displayed in regard to this matter as to the necessity of episcopal ordination for a valid ministry. It was not, for example, till 1662 that the last sentence in the first paragraph in the Preface to the Ordinal¹ was added; but even that sentence, which is the strongest pronouncement on the point in the Prayer Book, goes no further than to say that no one can be regarded as a minister of the *Church of England* unless he has been episcopally ordained. There is no statement in any of the Church formularies which declares non-episcopal ministries invalid. The result is that that theory of Church Government, called in the seventeenth century "Moderate Episcopacy," can claim standing-ground in the Church of England to-day, and I think I may say everybody knows that it is only along the lines of "moderate episcopacy" that it is possible to approach reunion with non-episcopal communions with the

¹ "No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest or Deacon in the Church of England, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal Consecration or Ordination."—*Preface to the Ordinal*.

slightest hope of success. But the discussion of this is clearly outside the scope of this paper.

Thus the Church of England has by this restraint kept the door of the sheepfold open so that the sheep of each generation may go in and out and find pasture. No doubt there are advantages in the other system whereby the flock is hedged in by a barbed-wire entanglement of precise definition ; no doubt the open door makes it possible for sheep that look strangely like goats to sojourn for a time with us. But despite the uncertainty, despite the cut and thrust of controversy, despite even that most evil thing, " party spirit," who can doubt that our Church has chosen the better way ? I conclude with the last and grandest sentence in the Dean of St. Paul's book, *England*, in which I have taken leave to paraphrase one word : " This much I can avow, that never, even when the stormclouds appear blackest, have I been tempted to wish that I was other than an Anglican."

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY THE REV. H. D. A. MAJOR, D.D., F.S.A., PRINCIPAL
OF RIPON HALL, OXFORD

THE Anglican interpretation of the Christian Faith is twofold. The first of these two interpretations is best described as dogmatic and documentary, and the other as practical and popular.

The first interpretation is contained in the Church's dogmatic formularies, especially in the Creeds, XXXIX Articles, and Catechism. These dogmatic formularies (especially the Creeds) our Church asserts as a fundamental principle "ought thoroughly to be received and believed : for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture."¹ That was in the days before the Higher Criticism of the Scriptures. As the Higher Criticism has changed our view of the nature of the Scriptures, so it has changed our view of the things that can be proved by the Scriptures. I do not propose, however, to discuss that controversial issue in this paper, as it is my intention to deal only, and even then very cursorily, with the second, namely, that practical interpretation of the Christian Faith which is distinctive of the English Church.

This practical interpretation is, I believe, nearer present-day reality than the documentary interpretation. He who desires to secure this practical interpretation examines the English Church in action: he studies her conduct and character as revealed by History. From such an examination he learns more truly what is the real mind and faith of the English Church than can be secured by a rigidly literalist or legalist exegesis of her formularies. This practical test would certainly be our Lord's test: "By their fruits ye shall know them," and St. James's test: "I will shew thee my faith by my works."

(1) The most conspicuous characteristic of the English Church's interpretation of the Christian Faith is its *comprehensiveness*, if that interpretation is to be inferred from the breadth of the membership of the English Church. I once said to a well-known Unitarian, who stressed the complete dogmatic and liturgical freedom of his denomination: "Theoretically Unitarianism may be wider than the Church of England, but practically, to judge by the range and variety of its Church membership, the English Church is wider than Unitarianism." To this he assented. Practically every variety of interpretation of the Christian Faith, which falls short of professed Roman Catholicism on the one hand and professed Unitarianism on the other, has its place in the English Church. This comprehensiveness may have been due partly to the political exigencies of Tudor times, but it is not fair, I think, to represent it as being dominantly due to political opportunism. In England, more, I think, than in any other nation, Evangelical or Protestant reforming zeal was leavened by the spirit of

Renaissance Humanism, and by a sense of the continuity of Church life. Such Tudor divines as John Colet, Thomas Cranmer, and Richard Hooker, each of whom exerted a powerful influence on the English interpretation of the Christian Faith, exhibit these characteristics.

This comprehensiveness, at which our opponents sneer as the fatuous effort to house three religions under one roof, may not at times be a very comfortable proceeding, but it is an immensely profitable one. It makes for a many-sidedness of Church life. The interaction of competing, or even conflicting, interpretations of the Christian Faith by the different schools within the Church contributes powerfully to needful and fruitful theological development.

(2) The second characteristic of the English interpretation of the Christian Faith, which I desire to stress, is its *reasonableness*. Here our Church stands on common ground with the great theologian of the Church of Rome, St. Thomas Aquinas. Perhaps our standpoint here is best expressed by those well-known passages in Bishop Butler's *Analogy*, the one where he calls Reason "the candle of the Lord within us" (II, ix. 7), and the other where he says :

"I express myself with caution, lest I should be mistaken to vilify Reason, which is indeed the only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even Revelation itself" (II, iii, 3).

The English Church cannot admit into its interpretation of the Christian Faith, even though it claims ancient and powerful support, anything which is clearly unreasonable. As the judicious Hooker well maintains :

“That authority of men should prevail with men either against or above reason is no part of our belief.”¹

I remember once discussing this point with the late Dean Rashdall, who concluded the conversation with these words :

“If I did not believe that the Christian Faith is essentially rational, I could not be a Christian.”

Like Professor Hort, he held that :

“There can be no surer sign of decrepitude and decay in faith than a prevalent nervousness about naming and commending Reason.”²

Our Church understands by Reason something wider than the purely intellectual or logical faculty, as S. T. Coleridge resolutely insists when confuting Ultrafidianism.³

It is this reliance on Reason in the interpretation of the Faith which causes the English Church to value sound learning so highly. Bishop Creighton, in his illuminating paper on “The Position of the Church of England” (in *The Church and the Nation*), wrote :

“The formula which most explains the position of the Church of England is that it rests on an appeal to sound learning” (p. 251).

Later on in the same paper, he points to modest veracity as the quality with which sound learning should endow both the Church and the individual Churchman. He remarks that :

“It requires a great deal of knowledge to be able

¹ *Eccl. Pol.*, II, 7, 6.

² Cf. Hort's *Hulsean Lectures* (Appendix).

³ *Aids to Reflection* (Bell's ed., 1903), pp. 138, 277 *et passim*.

to answer a question by saying, 'I do not know.' " Hence " sound learning must always wear the appearance of a compromise between ignorance and plausible hypothesis."

This leads him to point out that the English Church "is exposed to exceptional dangers because of its high standard. It requires of *all* its sons a conscious effort to raise themselves to the level of the demands which it makes on their intelligence. . . . The great danger of the present day is lest the aspirations of the highest minds, profoundly Christian and profoundly moral, should desert all ecclesiastical systems because they are stereotyped by the remnants of ancient controversies and present suspicions."

The Church of England in her interpretation of the Faith, because she reverences the veracity of sound learning, accepts, in Bishop Francis Paget's phrase, "the discipline of incompleteness." He remarks :

"There may be much that is striking in the easily recognized adherence to a concise body of dogma ; a compact scheme, an authority within four walls, but it is loyalty to every fragment of truth, to all its dim revealings . . . that God looks for, I believe, from us, as our part, our service for the truth's sake."

Our Church believes in the use of the trained Reason as an aid to the right interpretation of the Faith and to the right understanding of the Scriptures, against which it declares "it is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything" "that it should be believed as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation" (Articles XX and VI).

(3) Another characteristic of the English interpretation of the Faith is stress on its *moral* character. Henry More, the Cambridge Platonist, declared that God had forbidden to be received as His Mandates

“aught that is not stamped with the Great Seal of the Conscience and countersigned by the Reason.”

So marked is this stress on the moral aspect of the Faith that Matthew Arnold could even define religion as “Morality touched by emotion.” For the English Churchman the decisive mark of a Christian is not his orthodoxy, or his denomination, but that he is a good man. It was a Roman Catholic Englishman, Alexander Pope, bred under the shadow of the English Church, who wrote :

“For forms of faith let ruthless bigots fight,
His can’t be wrong, whose life is in the right.”

The magnificently ethical presentation of our Duty towards God, and our Duty towards our Neighbour, taught to all young Churchmen in our Catechism, is no doubt largely responsible for this, as is also the reading of the Ten Commandments in the Communion Service—a use peculiar to the English Church.

(4) Another characteristic of her interpretation of the Faith is our Church’s consciousness of *fallibility*. It is really very remarkable that our Church, although she believes in inspiration, yet does not believe in infallibility. Edmund Burke spoke of her as a Church “professing fallibility.” When she declares in Article XXI that “General Councils . . . may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God,” she makes it impossible for us to believe that she could be so egregious as to regard herself as infallible in her distinctive interpretations of the Faith. The memory of the great changes made in her presentation of the Faith in the Tudor period would

¹ *Life*, p. 114.

be a sufficient reminder of her fallibility. Her history justifies Edmund Burke's statement that :

"As a Church she claims and has always exercised a right of reforming whatever appeared amiss in her doctrine, her discipline, or her rites."¹

The belief in the constant operation of the Spirit of Truth, ever ready to guide throughout the ages the loyal and obedient into all Truth, is the foundation of this wise humility.

(5) The last, but not least important, characteristic of the English interpretation of the Faith which I propose to stress on this occasion, is that it is *English*. This is due, in part at least, to the consciousness that our Church is interpreting the Faith for the English people (the *gens Anglorum*, to use Bede's phrase). This does, no doubt, render her interpretation open to the charge of "insularity," that it is "a white cliffs of Dover" product, but this does not disturb the English theologian. Bishop Creighton uttered a warning against attempting to break down this insularity precipitately. Why should not our interpretation be as precious, not merely for ourselves, but for humanity, as Roman, Italian, Teutonic, Swiss, Slav, Greek, and Oriental interpretations? I venture to give a reason for an affirmative answer which may seem to some arrogantly English. I am the more moved to give this answer because those, who so persistently desire to Latinize our Church in the interests of reunion, seem to ignore it. At the opening of the Tudor period, when our distinctively English interpretation of the Faith begins, England, as

¹ *Speech*, Feb. 6, 1772.

Professor Trevelyan points out, was located in maps of the world as an isolated country on its north-west edge. Rome in these maps was placed in the centre of the world. During the last four hundred years the relative geographical position of these two places has altered. England has moved into the centre of the known world, and Rome has moved very appreciably away from it. This is symbolical of what has been happening in the world of theological thought and ecclesiastical expansion. Would that our Church's teachers to-day could realize the extreme value of the English interpretation of the Faith, not simply for the English people at home and beyond the seas, but for humanity, and so shun the popular ecclesiastical vice of continentalizing our theology. The genius of the English Church—and we say it in humble gratitude to the Spirit of God—is much too great and too precious to be enslaved or betrayed. Her value for her own peoples and for humanity is to be found in being true to herself and in looking only to God, for guidance and authority.

Archbishop Wake, reviewing the course of his correspondence with the Gallicans in 1717, wrote of the Church of England :

“She has a plenary authority within herself, and has no need to recur to any other Church to direct her what to retain and what to do.”¹

Our English interpretation reflects in many ways the spirit of the English people. What that spirit is we can see writ large and fair on History's page, and shall, I believe, see it written also with permanent

¹ Perry's *Church History*, Vol. III, p. 47.

ink in the history of the Universal Christian Church of the future.

Our revered Primate has summarized these characteristics in his charge, entitled *The Character and Call of the Church of England*, and with a sentence from it I conclude:

“And lastly, we stand for the principle of plainness, openness, and simplicity in all formularies, usages, and services, so that every word of each may, so far as possible, be understood and followed by even the unlearned among our people” (p. 47).

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY THE REV. CANON H. L. GOUDGE, D.D., REGIUS
PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY, OXFORD

NEARLY two thousand years ago our Lord was born into the Church of God. It was a national Church that He found, but He came to make it no longer national. In the Church that He desires there can be neither Jew nor Greek, neither Eastern nor Western, neither Latin nor Teuton; we must be "all one man in Christ Jesus." But with nations, as with men, there are diversities of gifts, bestowed that within the one family of God there may be mutual service and so mutual love. All alike, rooted and grounded in love, are to be strong to apprehend—not separately, but "with all the saints"—what is the breadth and length and depth and height of God's redeeming purpose. What, then, is the place of the Anglican interpretation of the Christian faith? God has given great gifts to His English children, and His Spirit to consecrate the gifts; but we are only one nation out of many. Our interpretation will be of great value; but at its best it will be incomplete, unbalanced, inadequate to the reality to be interpreted. It will need, like that of every other nation, both criticism and supplement.

But what is Anglicanism? It is a form of Western Christianity; apart from the work of Theodore of Tarsus, the Christian East has hardly affected us. Thus our interpretation of the common faith is chiefly a moral and practical interpretation. We have little sense of the supernatural; we find thought, contemplation, and even prayer very difficult, and the fasting that prepares us for them very unwelcome. But, though we are Westerners, Anglicanism differs greatly from Latin Christianity. The English were never subjects of the Roman Empire, or really included in the Holy Roman Empire. Our national life is older than that of the neighbouring peoples; and, though Latin influences were strong in the Middle Ages, they did not greatly affect our national character, and in the sixteenth century were easily cast aside. Thus our national feeling is strong; we are bad Churchmen as we are bad Europeans; we care greatly for freedom of thought, speech and action, and little for authority, discipline or order.

But, of course, we must not identify Anglicanism with English Christianity, or suppose that because the Church of England retains a peculiar relation to the State it is in the full sense national. Before the sixteenth century the Church of England included practically all the Christians of England; but the violence of the Pope and of the Tudor monarchs rent it asunder. Moral and religious reformation were no doubt greatly needed; and had the necessary changes been carried through by men of high character for none but moral and religious ends, and with proper consideration for those who loved the old ways, the Church of England might have been both national and reformed.

The vast majority of religious Conservatives were no Papalists of the new Counter-Reformation model, but as loyal to the State as any other Englishmen ; and they ought to have been retained. They were alienated partly by the crimes of the Tudor monarchs and their instruments, and partly by the novelty of the new standards of doctrine and worship imposed. Thus, when Calvinistic Protestantism came in like a flood from overseas, the Church of England possessed little to counterbalance it, and under the Commonwealth went down altogether. When the old *régime* was restored, reprisals followed, and we lost the Puritans just as we had lost the Recusants. A little later, by the fault of the State, we lost the Non-Jurors, the best Churchmen left, and sank into the deadness of the eighteenth century. Then came the Evangelical and the Oxford Movements ; and between them they saved the Church of England, though they did not radically transform it. But again we lost, by our want of sympathy and justice, thousands whom we ought to have kept. We English Christians, though seldom cruel, are not and never have been tolerant. Too often, as Oliver Cromwell said, we demand liberty for ourselves, and then, having obtained it, as far as our power goes deny it to others. Thus Anglicanism to-day is far from co-extensive with the religion of the English people, though it is more typical of their outlook than either English Romanism or English Nonconformity. Let us consider a few of its characteristics.

First, as we have already seen, the Englishman is practical rather than mystical or intellectual. Like all practical people, he is interested in facts rather

than in thought; his contributions to physical science have been great, and to philosophy small. So it is in his religion. The Englishman pays attention to facts, to those especially which have come within his personal experience. He will not accept a theory because it is beautiful, or because it is logical, or because it is intellectually brilliant; he asks whether the facts as a whole support it. Indeed, he is slow to form, or to accept, theories of any kind, and ready to correct them, when accepted, if new facts demand it. Thus our historical criticism is admirable; if less original and erudite than that of some other nations, it is more solidly grounded. When new knowledge threatens to overwhelm us, the Englishman keeps his head. New knowledge may overthrow old theories, but not old facts; and his faith is rooted in the latter rather than in the former. Thus he neither buries his head in the sand, as Latin Christians so often do, nor swallows whole the latest theories. He goes back to his facts, reconsiders them in the light of the new knowledge, makes the necessary adjustments, and ends by believing very much what he believed before. His watchword in religion is not "all or nothing"; he is satisfied with such imperfect knowledge as the facts afford. Neither Continental Catholics nor Continental Protestants have much here to teach us, while we have much to teach them.

Moreover, this regard for facts is shown in another way. The Englishman deals with men as he finds them, and, though rather fond of wide generalizations, pays little attention to them in practice. Hardly ever, for example, do we hear a good word

spoken for "the Bishops"; yet the individual Bishop is almost always respected and liked, and often revered and loved. The syllogism affectionately known as Barbara does not hold in England; a highly unpopular class may consist entirely of highly popular individuals. So it is with the English clergyman in his parish. He may detest Roman Catholicism or Nonconformity, and regard his own variety of Anglicanism as the one thing needful. But he knows well that in fact people are seldom what in theory they ought to be; he sees his parishioners much as they are, and deals with them accordingly. His parishioners in their turn deal similarly with him and with one another. Though often prejudiced and intolerant, we appreciate character wherever we find it. Religious hatreds can be aroused in England, but not sustained. Our "violent fires soon burn out themselves," and we return to our natural kindness and geniality.

But now we must look at the other side. When there is need for coherent and constructive thinking, we fail badly. An Englishman, Bishop Creighton said, "hates an idea when he sees it." Too often he not only neglects thought, but despises it, and counts it a merit to be illogical both in thought and practice. He supposes that because a view that is logical is frequently false, a view which is illogical is frequently true. That is a deplorable *non sequitur*. If a logical view is false, it is because there is something wrong with the premises; but an illogical view is false every time. So it is with systems. A logical system may be a failure because it does not take account of facts; but an illogical system, though

parts of it may be excellent, always brings its nemesis of disaster, as we find in the relations of Church and State in England to-day. The Englishman is right in insisting upon facts. But he fails to see that facts, like Sir Joshua Reynolds' colours, must be "mixed with brains"; they must be collected, compared, and understood, if anything worthy of the name of truth is to issue from them. Thus we build far too much upon our own individual experience to the neglect of the formulated experience of the Church as a whole. Suppose that we criticize the methods of an earnest Anglo-Catholic or Evangelical. He will say that he has found them to work, and strongly object to any interference with them. He forgets that those whom his methods attract are those who are like himself, and that an experience so limited has no great value.

Now it is our want of systematic thought which is the source both of the weakness of our theology and of our inefficiency as teachers. To take but one example, the Anglican position can be expounded at least as logically as the Roman, but we scarcely ever attempt to show this, and let our case go by default. As a rule, we grasp little but disconnected fragments of truth. We do not distinguish between fundamental principles and questionable deductions, and generally mean by a principle merely something about which we feel strongly. Thus we will almost ignore doctrines of the Creed, and fight to the death for our particular view of the Eucharist. It is this which makes us so tiresome in controversy; we do not know what is important and what is not. It is this, again, which is the source of our opportunism.

It is due neither to cowardice nor to self-seeking ; it is that we do not recognize the principles for which we ought to stand, or grasp them so weakly that they weigh lightly against immediate practical inconveniences. We act first and think afterwards ; we learn our principles by what we have thought it advisable to do.

What, then, are we to say about the Anglican interpretation of the Christian faith ? Its strength lies in our strong grip both of the historical facts upon which it rests and of the abiding facts of human life which support it. But we seldom have any clearly thought out interpretation of it, and Anglicanism is generally no coherent *via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism.

We pass now to a second point. The Englishman is an individualist. Efficient personally, if given a free hand, he will not endure the limitations of his freedom necessary for corporate action. Not only must he preserve his intellectual honesty by thinking freely ; he must always say what he thinks, however crude and undeveloped his thought as yet may be ; and act upon it, in spite of the trouble and confusion which his action causes. He only despises Barbara, but he hates D.O.R.A. Thus with us the system counts for little ; almost everything depends upon individual character and personality, and happily there is no lack of either. Our practical interpretation of the Christian faith admirably brings out its power to purify and ennoble individual character, but stops short at that point ; the great truths which fill the Epistle to the Ephesians we neither grasp ourselves nor interpret to others.

Let us begin with the good side. Is it too much to claim that no other nation produces as great a variety of noble types of Christian character? Consider first our clergy. The ideal of the priesthood found in Roman books of devotion is a very lofty one, but it is inelastic. We have splendid clergy who embody the Roman type, but with us it is but one type among many; our English clergy make a far more varied appeal. Our freedom here has, no doubt, its dangers; sometimes we cultivate an unconventionality which is itself conventional; but the good far outweighs the evil. It is very important, when we have educated our clergy properly, to give them as far as possible a free hand. They are Englishmen; and to restrain them too much by Episcopal interference, or Parochial Councils, or even Prayer Books, is a grave blunder. It takes the heart out of them by hindering the exercise of their best qualities; it makes their position unattractive, and discourages men from entering the ministry. Or consider our laity. How rich they are in new creations! Take, for example, an English Christian soldier. You cannot learn what he is by learning what is a soldier and what is a Christian, and combining your information; he is something new which is more than either. So with a Christian doctor, or a Christian artisan. Each is a new and valuable interpretation of the Christian faith.

But then this strong individuality brings with it a corresponding weakness in corporate life and action. In practical matters the Englishman never feels safe in trusting any judgment but his own, and shoots the expert at sight. He will bow to authority in

such matters as astronomy ; the planets continue their accustomed courses, and there is nothing to be done about it even by an Englishman. But in practical matters he follows his own lights. To know the party in the Church to which he usually belongs affords you little information, though our controversialists forget this ; at any moment he may break out in a new place. Of course we take counsel together ; we have, as Dean Vaughan said, an endless series of compounds of "Con." But we pay little attention to each other's arguments ; we say what we came to say, and say it often. What, then, is to be done ? "Go to : let us form a Committee." The Committee is appointed, presumably of our best. It reports : we thank the Committee, and return the Report for reconsideration. Finally, perhaps, we try again ourselves, and arrive at some sort of compromise. Shall we support that ? Yes, if it is the compromise that we ourselves approve. Otherwise we find it dangerous, or uninteresting, and decline to carry it out. But before this stage is reached others have taken a hand. There is the delightful person who appears as the representative (so he says) of the great silent majority who do not go to Conferences, and in whom the native hue of English piety and insight has not been sicklied o'er by the pale cast of information about the matter in hand ; and there is the broadminded person who does not believe in purely Christian Assemblies, but prefers the sound spiritual instinct of the average Englishman as represented by the House of Commons. Very English they both are ; if there is an authority that the individual Englishman trusts, it is the

average Englishman, provided always that he agrees at the time with the individual Englishman. So no conclusion is reached ; and what at first was rather amusing comedy arouses at last the impatience of pit and stalls alike, and threatens to turn to tragedy. In spite of the Creeds we repeat, we have little idea of the Catholic Church, and of the relation of national Churches to it ; indeed, we have little idea of our own relation to what we so oddly call " our " Church. What kind of interpretation, then, can we give of the Christian faith with its insistence upon unity and solidarity ? So far from " our " Church supporting us, we have to support " our " Church ; and we find the fellowship which the spiritual life requires in our own coterie or party rather than in " our " Church as a whole. We do not see that in a Church which does not foolishly claim to be infallible it is far better to make mistakes, which further experience will enable us to correct, than to come to no decisions. As individuals we often set a noble example ; but as members of a body we help other nations chiefly by showing them what to avoid.

Once again. In the Englishman the moral sense is relatively strong and the religious sense relatively weak ; and so he tends either to identify religion with morality, or to regard the former simply as a help towards the latter. Religion seldom dominates him ; he is seldom either a bigot or a saint. But in his daily life he has as high a sense of duty as is to be found anywhere ; without self-respect he is miserable ; and, if he thinks that religion can here help him, he gives it a warm welcome. But at this point he generally stops short. He wants his natural

life purified and uplifted, but not sacrificed or subordinated to any supernatural claim. In a word, he rejects the Cross.

But now let us do him justice. The Englishman has one characteristic, for which we may forgive him almost anything: he is sure that a religion which does not bring with it a high standard of conduct is a worthless religion. All Christians may in words admit this; but the Englishman knows it, feels it and acts upon it, as Eastern and Latin Christians do not; and some of his apparent irreligion arises from his detestation of profession without practice. "Why call ye me, Lord, Lord, and do not the things which I say?" Those great words may not make the Englishman obedient, but they do prevent him while he is disobedient from offering Our Lord a worship which He will not accept.

But is our view of the relation of morality to religion the right one? Let us see. It is the peculiar glory of Christianity that in it religion and morality are inseparable. But the two differ greatly both in their origin and in their purpose, and neither can be a substitute for the other. The purpose of religion is union with God, and the attainment of the life and power and blessedness which we believe to follow from it. But this desire has no necessary connection with morality; if our ideas of God are false and degrading, religion, as the Hebrew prophets knew, may be one of the worst enemies of morals. If, however, we believe that God is the eternal righteousness, such righteousness as is as yet possible is necessary if we are to draw near to Him; while a far higher righteousness may be ours, if we have drawn

near and received of His Spirit. Our Lord lays great stress upon the first truth, and St. Paul upon the second. But no sort of morality is a substitute for union with God, nor should the desire for morality be the one motive for seeking after Him. Will you pardon a homely illustration? A good wife is a great help to good conduct; but in courtship that is not the point on which we lay stress, nor would it lead to success if we laid it there. Love should occupy the first place; we are most likely to succeed if we can tell the one whom we love that we cannot "live" without her. Moral improvement may result from marriage, but it is a by-product; and a wife whom we had sought only for the sake of morality would be very unlikely to help us to it. Now English and American Christians are very apt in their religion to make a similar mistake. They are interested in the building of their own characters, and in the welfare of the nations to which they belong; and they value religion just as a means to the ends which they have in view. But that is to make God, like the good wife, a means to ends which leave Him on one side; and that we must not do. God does not exist to fulfill our purposes; on the contrary, we exist to fulfill His. I am not saying that the desire for victory over sin is not a right motive for seeking God. But it is only adequate if, like St. Paul, we feel sin as sin, and not merely as an obstacle to that self-respect and national welfare which are rightly dear to us.

Now this "moralism" of ours is a serious hindrance to a right interpretation of the Christian faith in several ways: we will consider but one. Not only does the Englishman tend to regard our Lord primarily

as a teacher, but primarily as a moral teacher in a very restricted sense. When, for example, he quotes the Lord's words, "By their fruits ye shall know them," he often supposes that our Lord had nothing in view but the simple human duties that the Englishman himself so fully recognizes. He forgets that the law has two tables, and not only one ; and that the first and great commandment is not the love of man, but the love of God. Though no doubt it is in the love of man that the love of God must largely be shown, it is not to be shewn in that way alone. Love is the fulfilling of the law ; but the love of man, were it possible without the love of God, would be less than half its fulfilment. Those high and exacting duties to God which the Church Catechism so admirably enumerates—fear, love, trust, worship, and the rest—are in their performance just as much fruits by which Christ's followers are to be known as those of which the Englishman more immediately thinks ; if we do not perform them, we are not fully moral. Here again we fail badly. Wherever the Christian Englishman goes, he interprets and commends his faith by his justice, his truth, his honesty and his humanity. But on the Godward side he misinterprets it, and his apparent irreligion is the scandal of the heathen world.

To sum up, then. We should not despise Anglicanism, but we should not rest satisfied with it. We must be English to the English that we may gain the English ; but we must not be too English. The Lord's example is clear. Just because His earthly mission was to the Jews alone, He attacked Jewish vices and Jewish self-complacency as He attacked

no others ; that is why He was called a Samaritan, and died upon the Cross.

May I, then, say a word to you on behalf of some of our brothers who are not here to speak for themselves—not "moderate" Anglo-Catholics, who receive full justice in the Church of England, but (if you will) "extreme" Anglo-Catholics, who do not. Why do we so much dislike them? Chiefly because we find them un-English; their other faults, real or alleged, we mostly share with them. But have they not a special value to us just because they are un-English? At any rate, they are trying to remind us that, in St. Paul's language, the word of God neither went forth from us nor came to us alone; and that no adequate interpretation of the Christian faith is possible while we do not consider what it has meant to other nations as great and as gifted as our own. At any rate, they stand for a theology which, as far as it goes, is definite and coherent; the Church means far more to them than to most of us; they are witnesses to the truth that morality, like patriotism, is "not enough," but that we owe to God a worship not devised by ourselves, but by Him appointed for us, and to be offered, not primarily for our self-improvement, but as an act of homage to Him. Are they, after all, so very "extreme"? We should "use large maps." The centre of Gloucestershire is not identical with the centre of England, nor the centre of England with the centre of the world. In a similar way what is "central" in Anglicanism may not be identical with what is central in a larger Christianity. Is it not possible that in those characteristics of ours,

with which this paper has been concerned, we may be ourselves extreme, and that even extreme Anglo-Catholics may on a large map be a good deal nearer the centre than most Anglicans? Should we not try to comprehend them in more senses than one, and to comprehend them as they are, instead of asking them to surrender what they regard as essential to the work that they are trying to do?

Have we indeed after our losses in the past “learned nothing and forgotten nothing”? Of course, if the Church of England is indeed “our” Church, we may do with it what we will; if we find Anglo-Catholics in the way, we may of course get rid of them. But if the Church of England is not “our” Church, but the Church of Jesus Christ, our rights are severely limited; we may exclude from it none who give to Him the faith that He requires, and desire to keep His commandments. We may regard as erroneous the particular view of the Eucharist taken by Anglo-Catholics, and the practice that follows from it as undesirable; but what has this to do with the matter? Do we seriously maintain that any word of the Lord condemns either? And if we do not, we have no right to make their abandonment a condition of membership in the Lord’s Church. Tolerance means, not just the toleration of what we do not greatly dislike, but the toleration of what we do greatly dislike; and we English Christians have still to learn it.

THE ANGLICAN INTERPRETATION OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH

BY THE REV. A. NAIRNE, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF
DIVINITY, CAMBRIDGE

IF you would know how the Church of England serves God, said Selden, go to the Book of Common Prayer; consult not this or that man. A happy issue of our late controversy is this at least: we all know better than before how well we love the Prayer Book. Its contents are a medley from ages far and near. Its character is controlled by the seventeenth century; by that half of the seventeenth century which preceded the revision, that romantic period when men were spending lives for strange and spiritual ideas, for King or Liberty, Church Order or Independence. From Oxford, 22 March 1645, King Charles wrote to the young Prince of Wales: "Once again I command you upon my blessing to be constant to your religion . . . for know that a persecuted Church is not thereby less pure, though less fortunate." So Clarendon records, whose *History*, read through during a summer holiday, settled me for ever as an English Churchman; Clarendon who knows no church but the one church of the Creed, catholic and apostolic; functioning in England, practically; who tells the story of his master's dying to

save it, and saving it ; who casually illustrates its genius by examples of statesmen, soldiers, scholars : Laud with his faults and “ the lustre of a pious life and his unpolished integrity ” ; Sir Jacob Astley, “ an honest, brave, plain man ” ; Falkland, Chillingworth, etc.

Nor is Cromwell, in his *Letters and Speeches*, less impressive and attractive. In him, too, burns the temper of that ultramundane period. Look at his letter from Edinburgh, 4 February 1650, about the Medal : “ Whereas, if my poor opinion may not be rejected by you, I have to offer that which I think the most noble end, to wit, the Commemoration of that great mercy at Dunbar and the gratuity to the army. Which might be better expressed upon the medal by engraving, as on the one side the parliament, which I hear was intended and will do singularly well, so on the other side an army with this inscription over the head of it, The Lord of Hosts, which was our Word that day . . . It will be very thankfully acknowledged by me if you will spare having my effigies in it.” Consider, too, John Milton, that lonely heresiarch, and the Cambridge Platonists, harpers harping upon their harps of glory of peace and goodwill ; and John Spencer extending, like these last, Christian kinship to “ all faithful people,” and inaugurating the comparative study of religions. And listen to Coleridge in *The Friend* (II. i). “ . . . That momentous period during which all possible forms of truth and error (the latter being themselves for the greater part caricatures of truth) bubbled up on the surface of the public mind as in the ferment of a chaos. It would be difficult to conceive a notion

or a fancy in politics, ethics, theology, or even in physics or physiology, which had not been anticipated by the men of that age."

A dangerous time: "Lighten our darkness" meant something different when Dr. Rochecliffe read evensong at Woodstock than it had meant in a medieval monastery; a time of new thought and discovery; of recovery as well as novelty, a corrected renaissance; above and through all a time when men cared for eternal things not seen, and would die for an idea. That was the time which ensouled our Book of Common Prayer and set "the Anglican interpretation of the Christian faith."

The Prayer Book is no prudent sensible golden mean:—"I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is already kindled."

The word "mystical" has been vulgarised. It is used in the Prayer Book of the water of Baptism for "the mystical washing away of sin," of "the mystical body" of Christ "which is the blessed company of all faithful people." In the Prayer Book "mystical" is the Greek equivalent for the Latin "sacramental." And the sacramental interpretation of faith is highly characteristic of the English Church. Her countrified beauty is sacramental. Many have remarked on the peculiarity of English cathedrals: that they stand free of the streets, country cathedrals. Her country parishes are her vitality; an unpretentious holiness is required in a country parson, and in general is bred in him sooner or later. Truly an inward grace answers to this idyllic sign. But already the idyll fades and less lovely conditions of modern civilization press. And

our Church does on the whole show special aptitude to meet modernity. It is not sentimental. It enters with high spirit upon the seemingly unromantic necessity. And it transubstantiates the commonplace the monotonous the grim. It takes the changing manners of the day with trustful humour, assimilating change as the will of God, and taking no thought for pedantic prejudices about the morrow.

Thus in large meaning: What of the sacraments as instituted rites? Go to the Book of Common Prayer, consulting not this man or that, and it will appear that the Church of England serves God therein according to the plain man's practical reverence, which is the way of antiquity. For the ancient liturgies throw little light on what have been the subjects of controversy in later days, but these two things they do stress: prayer, earnest and intense, that the water of Baptism may indeed cleanse unto new life, and that the bread and wine may indeed be the Body and Blood of Christ: then that, the sacramental rite being duly performed, the reality, the effect of the sacrament may be fulfilled in daily life.

And this effect is ensued with much earnestness in our order. Confirmation makes an immense difference to an English boy. Hitherto worship has been—I take him and it sympathetically—a repose and refreshment. Now he ascends to the altar and eats the flesh and drinks the blood of the crucified Saviour. That is mystery tragedy and heroic hope. The preluding of childhood is past. He has entered with his Lord upon a real world of sin and suffering, cruel pitiable, but able to be saved. Now and henceforth he labours like a man

for the costly victory. Gladdened by the sacrament, he continually endures the sacramental life.

Our Prayer Book is, however, mystical in the more commonly accepted significance of that word. Can we recover a less trite term? Would Reverie do? That word does fit the sense and has been thus used in good prose; and its history lends it a double stimulance. For in its early Chaucerian use it was derived from the French for passion, raving; in the eighteenth century it returned to represent the stillness of the soul, deep-dreaming. And whenever rightly used it holds fast to reason: "The spirit of man is the lamp of the Lord."

"When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness . . . he shall save his soul alive." Thus the Prayer Book opens; sublimely, thought Borrow's gipsy; most common-sensibly, according to hasty prejudice. Anyhow, the verse may fairly be accepted as setting the key of the Prayer Book music. Certainly it insists on plain morality, "the lustre of a pious life, unpolished integrity." But consider how it stands in the context of Ezekiel: "Press to be a good textuaire" (as King James exhorted Prince Henry). Ezekiel is bravely modernizing. "The sins of the fathers . . . to the third and fourth generation" had been the orthodox doctrine from Moses till then. The facts of life confirmed it. That was inexorable law. But the prophet has learned something more, by experience philosophy and vocation. He proclaims that grace may supersede law. He corrects the partial text by the gracious continuous whole of revelation: Believe in the forgiveness of sins.

Pursue this idea through the Communion Service. Communion: in the vulgar tongue, cursing; and to hasty judges that describes the Service. Indeed, certain curses are rehearsed, which again express natural justice and, on the whole, facts of life in the long run. Then, that acknowledged and seriously faced, we are invited to the rich tenderness of divine grace, proclaimed with more poignantly heart-touching appeal than even Ezekiel could anticipate: "Let us return to him who is the merciful receiver of all true penitent sinners . . . take his easy yoke and light burden upon us, to follow him in lowliness, patience, and charity . . ." Then Psalm li., that profound exilic meditation upon David's archaic penitence. Then the austere simplicity of the Lord's Prayer; and so right forth to that final hyperbole of prayer, of reverie: "O most mighty God and merciful Father, who hast compassion upon all . . . Turn thou us, O good Lord, and so shall we be turned. Be favourable to thy people who turn to thee in weeping, fasting, and praying. Thou sparest when we deserve punishment, and in thy wrath thinkest upon mercy . . . Hear us, O Lord, for thy mercy is great, and after the multitude of thy mercies look upon us; through the merits and mediation of thy blessed Son, Jesus Christ our Lord."

Psalm li. turns our attention to the Psalter, the staple of anglican as of ancient devotion. Our division of the Psalter is complete and feasible for all, for busy laymen even who would fain go pray: for eccentric or parsimonious worshippers perhaps not quite convenient. More noteworthy is our use of

the Doxology after each several psalm, by which we pass beyond the sphere of literary origins and the dictionary mode, and by so universally intelligible a reverence turn imprecation into self-examination and correct jejune interpretations of great oracles : " When I wake up after thy likeness I shall be satisfied with it."

And the Lord's Prayer : how frequent in our services. And the people always repeat it : whence a habit has grown up. In any house, however wild, let the visiting priest begin " Our Father," and the family will say it with him. Affectionately considered, that is the vernacular of " With angels and archangels and all the company of heaven"; confession of consolatory faith in the Communion of Saints. Consider too the contents and temper of this prayer which asks for so little and so much : only for daily bread and deliverance from evil ; yet for God's glory and kingdom, and forgiveness like our own. Such economy, such audacity, fits the ultramundane aspiration of the Prayer Book. So prayer is generally made for salvation from fear, not from foes. And in the Visitation of the Sick, while forgiveness is assured with authoritative absolution, and peace and safety are entreated, recovery from sickness is left to God. And that noble trust is lowly, combined with confession of sin and recognition of divine discipline ; and throughout, infinite peace : " Peace to this house . . . Look down from heaven, visit and relieve . . . the Almighty Lord . . . now and evermore thy defence . . . make thee know and feel . . . the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace."

The heroic reverie of peace. "Wilt thou maintain and set forward," asks the bishop of the ordinands, "as much as lieth in you, quietness, peace, and love among all Christian people, and especially among them that are or shall be committed to your charge?"

All Christian people: that is the one and only Church.

Especially committed to your charge: that is the one Church functioning in England and England's kindly parishes.

That are or shall be: there is the Church of England pressing on towards the mark which is not predetermined by any wisdom of hers but foreseen as God's will, while each and all her children trust God and expect the Advent, doing duty in that state unto which it shall please God in His unceasing progress to call them.

There is the idea of the Church of England as the Christian faith is interpreted in the Book of Common Prayer. Books are not life, and our common life lags behind the book. But life goes on. Life is the fertile soil: books are its flowers, its vital symbols.

He marks that mild demeanour of them all;
How gaze their eyes, like lovers' eyes, far-off;
How smile their lips, a smile not of the earth.
Poor wights, how gentle is their clownish cheer;
As some the noblest of this world they were!

Marks Pudens, certain, kiss their adversaries;
And some, with tears confess their former guilts;
Some fallen, upon their faces, quake and weep;
Some bowed down in their prayer, make moan; that might
They no more stain their souls, to death; whereof
This body should be temple-raiment pure;
Until they see Christ's coming in the air!

So, according to Charles Doughty, the Church of England in the first century impressed a Roman soldier. So, in the mirror of the Prayer Book, the Church of England still recovers the face of her nativity.

THE FAITH AND MODERN THOUGHT

EVOLUTION AND THE IDEA OF GOD

BY THE VERY REV. W. R. INGE, D.D., F.B.A.,
DEAN OF ST. PAUL'S

BY the word "Evolution," as used in Science, is meant the production of more complex out of simpler forms. It is one kind of change—a very common but not a universal kind of change. There is an opposite process, in which a simpler form takes the place of a more complex. It happens that, in the phase through which our globe is passing, Evolution attracts more attention than Involution, though we have many examples of the latter, for instance, in vestigial organs.

We must not deify the principle of Evolution. It is a mere assumption, though it has been made even by writers of such repute as Herbert Spencer, that the more complex is necessarily the higher or better. Science, when it confines itself to its own domain, has nothing to do with value-judgments, except that, by an act of faith, it expects to find order and regular sequence, which are values, throughout the realm of nature. And even if we look for moral and æsthetic values within the natural order, we do not find that the more complex is always better than the simpler, the later than the earlier. There are blind alleys in nature, which have led

many species to final extinction. There is such a thing as progress in the direction of evil, as when a disease is said to be progressing. The German war-machine was as much a product of Evolution as the Church Congress. To those who think that the mere lapse of time must eventually bring about the Golden Age, the Devil replies, "You forget that I am evolving too." It is not even certain that we can assert Evolution in spiritual values. Rodin, the great sculptor, has said, "Progress exists in the world, but not in art. Pheidias will remain for ever without a rival." Jesus of Nazareth will remain for ever without a rival.

We must not deify Evolution. Evolution is always of finite things within a whole. We cannot infer, from the fact of human progress within the historical period, that the whole creation is in process of development towards "one far-off divine event." The great philosopher, F. H. Bradley, says that the idea of an evolution of the whole universe is meaningless or blasphemous. I will be content to say that it is contradicted by what we know of astronomy, and that the idea of a God who is Himself evolving in His creatures is incompatible with Christianity.

For the last three hundred years the cosmology or view of the universe derived from the natural sciences has dominated the minds of educated Europeans at the expense of other points of view derived from religion, morality, and art. We must not forget that other constructions may be equally legitimate, and that no abstract view, such as that of physical science must be, can convey the whole

truth. This is becoming easier for our generation to understand, because the old presuppositions of scientific thought, which have been almost unchallenged since Newton and Descartes, are being assailed from all sides. Instead of a dogmatic scientific creed, such as the Victorian age wished to impose upon us, we are confronted with a series of notes of interrogation.

“We thought that lines were straight, and Euclid true ;
God said, ‘Let Einstein be,’ and all’s askew !”

Let me enumerate some of these uncertainties, which cut very deep into any rounded scientific theory of the universe.

1. Is Space infinite? Einstein says that it is unbounded, but not infinite. He fixes a maximum extension of about a thousand million light-years (a light-year is about six billion miles). There is no beyond, for Space curves round upon itself. I must leave it to the Bishop of Birmingham to make it quite clear to you what this means.

2. There is the well-known “principle of Carnot,” by which, in accordance with the second law of thermo-dynamics, all energy passes irrevocably into a state in which it is no longer available. In plain words, the whole universe is running down like a clock. If so, the clock must have been wound up at a date which we could specify if we knew it, and the cosmic process is not everlasting. Or, alternatively, it is wound up periodically by some entirely unknown force.

3. Lavoisier, who founded chemistry on its present basis, introduced into it the principle that no material

is lost or gained in any chemical transformations. But Jeans and Eddington say that the stars are radiating away their mass, and that the inevitable end is "the annihilation of matter." If there is any building-up process to counteract the degradation of energy and the annihilation of matter, our pundits say that they have not yet found it.

4. Is the dictum that life cannot be generated from the inanimate still valid? We know that Kelvin and Arrhenius were driven to the expedient of suggesting that the spores of life may have travelled to the earth from outer space. But the belief is now steadily growing that the simplest forms of life were evolved from what we call lifeless matter. It is therefore very rash to base any religious apologetic on the theory of biogenesis, as Henry Drummond did. It is probably untrue; and if it were true, it could only support Calvinism, not Christianity.

5. Is the continuity of nature, which science has always assumed, really universal? The exponents of the Quantum theory have asserted that electrons appear successively in different orbits, much as a station clock jumps from minute to minute instead of moving steadily.

6. Are there countless other inhabited worlds like our own, or do we owe our existence to the unusual accident of a wandering star tearing a piece out of our sun?

7. What is Evolution? Is it a mechanical unpacking of what was there all the time, or the addition of something new? Bergson speaks of "creative Evolution," Lloyd Morgan of "emergent Evolution." Driesch and John Haldane think that they have

established a new vitalism, which shall be free from the objections which were fatal to the old vitalism. Pringle Pattison regretfully thinks that they have failed ; Needham says that the younger biologists will have nothing to do with vitalism in any form.

8. There is a school which thinks that natural selection has not played the leading part in Evolution which Darwin assigned to it ; and there is a school of neo-Lamarekians who think that acquired characteristics are transmitted.

9. Lastly, what are we to make of the "Space-time continuum" of Alexander and the relativists ?

My friends, we will look these difficulties boldly in the face—and pass on.

It is a formidable list of question-marks. Are we to infer that the whole of modern science is in the melting-pot, and that we may cheerfully go back to any traditional story of Creation which takes our fancy ? I should be very sorry to convey this impression. I believe that the chief revelation which God has granted to this generation has been through the natural sciences. If we shut our eyes to it, or denounce it, we do so at our peril—the peril of grieving the Spirit of truth. "Ever since the creation of the world," says St. Paul, "the invisible attributes of God—His eternal power and majesty—have been visible to the mind's eye through His works." But never before have they been so visible as they may be to us if we will consent to learn from the great men who have consecrated their lives and their abilities to studying them. Whether we follow them in their investigations of the unimaginably great or of the unimaginably small, the

picture rises before us of a simple and mainly uniform structure, composed of a very limited number of primary ingredients, obeying a small number of universal laws, linked together by a web of sympathies and affinities, and operative over inconceivable vistas of space and time.

Three impressions, I think, will predominate as we muse over the picture of the universe as science presents it to our minds. First, *Sublimity*. "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" And yet, what is the mind of man that can thus travel over the immensities, "beyond the flaming ramparts of the universe," as Lucretius says? We are abashed and exalted at once. Second, *Order*. All detached details find themselves in a coherent system. "Thou hast given them a law which cannot be broken." Third, *Purpose*. This is more controversial, I know; many scientists reject the idea of purpose. But surely there is something in what Professor J. A. Thomson says: "A self-stoking, self-repairing, self-preservative, self-adjusting, self-increasing, self-reproducing machine is only by an abuse of language called a machine at all."

We have now to consider whether such a picture as modern science gives us points most reasonably to Materialism, or Pantheism, or Theism. I can only attempt to answer this question by giving you the heads of an argument which, as is quite obvious, I have not time to develop. I will be as clear as I can, but I must be very brief.

1. I have said that we must not deify Evolution. Evolution is not a metaphysical principle, but a process within nature. It is a mere variety of change,

and there is nothing in its working which can explain how change is possible. Evolution cannot explain itself.

2. Change cannot exist, and cannot be thought of, except in relation to the unchanging. This is argued by Kant, and his proof has never been shaken. The idea of Evolution implies an unchanging background which is not itself evolving.

3. That which is not itself evolving must be a real Being not subject to space and time.

4. We ourselves could not be conscious of time and change unless we were, in our inmost nature, in contact with the supertemporal and superspatial. Evolution cannot have created our awareness of itself.

If this argument is valid, God can in no sense be a product of Evolution, nor can His Being be involved in it. This conclusion brings us into conflict with many notable writers of the school of Hegel, who are earnestly desirous of making their speculations lead up to religion, and even to the Christian religion. We owe much to some of these thinkers ; but it is one of their starting-points that the world must be as necessary to God as God is to the world. Their Deity is immanent in the Creation, and has no existence, at any rate for us, outside that relation. But *this* purely immanent God is not the God of Christianity. Nor can I see how such a Being could survive such a dissolution of His world as science predicts. We need a transcendent God, Who created the World, who gives it all the being that it has, but Who is not bound up with it. The hypothesis of a limited, militant God, which has appealed to minds so different as John Stuart Mill, Hastings Rashdall,

and H. G. Wells, may seem to absolve the Deity from complicity in the sin and suffering of the world : but only at the price of introducing an intractable dualism. If the Good and Evil Principles are matched against each other in the arena, who is the umpire ? And if I am right in holding that a world of change implies a timeless, eternal, unchanging background, we should then have to believe in a super-God behind the finite and non-omnipotent Deity whom we are asked to accept.

I wish to emphasize this necessity of setting the object of our worship above the flux of phenomena, just because it runs counter to so much current thought. Religion itself, no doubt, is evolving with those who possess it. There is nothing absolute within the world of becoming. But the object of faith is not within the world of time and change, and it is absolute. Religion always believes that there is an absolute reality and truth, and finds them in God. To assert ultimate relativity is to cut the nerve of faith. "The Lord sitteth above the water-flood ; the Lord remaineth a King for ever."

I see nothing in the belief in Evolution which conflicts with the belief in Creation, though it may be that, as even St. Augustine suggests, the world was not created at any point of time, but reflects in its everlastingness the eternity of its Maker. I am not troubled to find that science will have nothing to say to unending temporal progress, for this is no doctrine of Christianity. I value all the proofs of Divine immanence which are accumulating upon us, because they in no way contradict belief in transcendence. I am in no way disturbed by the

plain evidences of man's lowly origin, since we all know that every human individual began with microscopic germs much lower in the scale than any mammal. And lastly, if science has failed to construct a perfectly closed system ; if, as Emerson says, " there is a crack in all that God has made," may not this be an indication that time and space are not ultimate realities, and that this is why no perfectly coherent system can be based upon them ?

I wish to lay great stress on this last point. Evolution has its place only in time ; it belongs to the world of becoming. But, as St. Paul says, the things that are seen are temporal, the things that are not seen are eternal. Even if, as the most modern astronomers predict, the very materials of which our globe is compacted will at last be dissolved, we know that we have a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. Not only is God above the evolutionary process ; we also have a footing in that eternal world, of which we are citizens.

And so, whatever some of my philosophical friends may think of me, I see nothing in what science tells us about Evolution to prevent me from accepting the latest dogmatic definition of the attributes of God, drawn up at Rome in 1870, though the scholastic phraseology is not quite in accordance with modern ways of thinking: " There is one living and true God, Creator and Lord of heaven and earth, omnipotent, eternal, immense, incomprehensible, infinite in intellect and in will and in all perfection ; who being one, singular, absolutely simple and unchangeable spiritual substance, is to be regarded as distinct really and in essence from the world, most blessed

in and from Himself, and unspeakably elevated above all things that exist or can be conceived, except Himself."

My conclusion is that Evolution is only the method by which the eternal God carries out most of His purposes in the world. Belief in gradual change is taking the place of the older belief in catastrophic Divine intervention. It is a question about God's method of working. I do not think that the existence or attributes of God are involved in it at all.

THE INCARNATION AND MODERN THOUGHT

BY THE REV. R. J. CAMPBELL, D.D., VICAR OF HOLY
TRINITY, BRIGHTON

THE central tenet of the Christian faith, that of the Word made flesh, has once more become, as to the early and undivided Church, the principal subject of discussion among serious thinkers who regard the revelation of God in Christ as of supreme value to the world. Never since the Creed was finally formulated has the interest in this subject, and the difficulty of explicating it in terms of human knowledge and experience, been so deeply felt as to-day. In this respect the modern mind is faced in new ways with exactly the same problem that confronted the Christian consciousness fifteen centuries and more ago. The Creed was the answer to it, slowly and laboriously arrived at and with utmost economy of phrase, at the period when the Church was conquering the empire and shaping the civilization which we have inherited. The problem is the reason why we have a Creed at all. The Creed was not designed to cover the whole ground of the gospel message. Almost its sole purpose was that of articulating what the Church believed herself commissioned to hold and teach concerning Jesus Christ in relation to

God on the one hand and man on the other ; and it owed its existence to the successive controversies which arose in the envisagement of various facets of the problem in accordance with the modes of thought that then prevailed.

Those modes of thought are not ours ; the assumptions behind them are not ours ; our outlook is so different and the reasons for the change are so radical that we are compelled to examine the content of our experience of the living Christ anew and see what it yields. There is a disposition manifest in many quarters, both within and without the Church, to attempt to simplify the problem by falling back on a semi-Arian formula according to which our Lord is to be respected and admired, given a moral and spiritual pre-eminence, but not worshipped as divine in any other sense than that of being a unique human vehicle of the truth and love and grace of God. Thus the American Quaker scholar, Dr. Rufus Jones, says : " The theological battles over the metaphysical nature of Christ and over His relation to God the Father are among the most amazing facts of history. These battles were concerned not with the Galilean Jesus, but with a Greek theory of the Logos." The remark shows how far we have swung from the standpoint of the men to whom those battles were waged over vital realities ; but Dr. Rufus Jones and those who think with him seem to forget that but for those battles we should not be attributing to Jesus the value that we, in common with them, do to-day. And I make bold to say that the Christian life as we have come to interpret it could not sustain itself on any lower

view of the person of Jesus than that which proved victorious in those battles of long ago. No reduced Christology will ever prove acceptable to the Christian consciousness. In whatsoever terms we re-state our thought about Jesus, we must never make Him a smaller figure than the Jesus of Christian faith and devotion in the past, or the effort is doomed to failure. One may observe in passing also that an attempted simplification of the Christological problem which reduces Jesus to the ranks, as it were, and presents Him merely as a uniquely inspired human teacher, is a simplification that does not simplify. It multiplies difficulties and removes none.

Before we go any farther, let me ask this one question: How did it ever come to pass that men thought of attributing divinity to a Galilean carpenter; how was it that Jesus of Nazareth ever came to be worshipped as God manifest in the flesh? The answer is that it is through Him, and Him alone, that sinful man hopes to attain salvation and achieve his destiny in union with God. Apart from the Christian gospel of redemption, we should never have heard of any discussion of the Deity of Christ. Apart from this gospel we should not be discussing it to-day. It is not Christ as a teacher nor an example that we are chiefly concerned with, but Christ as a Saviour and deliverer. If He be not the latter, there is little profit in saluting Him as the former; and it is a matter of simple fact, not to be explained away, that if Jesus Christ had never been proclaimed as the Saviour of the world, scholars and thinkers would not to-day be examining His credentials as

the supreme religious genius of all time and the unique teacher of faith and morals.

It is often pointed out by critics of the traditional Christian view of His person that history can show belief in other saviour-gods and in other human beings raised to the status of divinity and worshipped after their death. Do not let us be led into any of these by-paths. There is no similarity between the way in which Jesus came to be thought of as a divine being and the way in which, say, the mythical Dionysus was so regarded or a Roman emperor received apotheosis. As Bishop Gore rightly says (*The Holy Spirit and the Church*, p. 85) : " There is no suggestion in any of these myths, as the ancients give them us, of a ' redeemer-god ' or a ' saviour-god ' who had come from heaven to save mankind by the sacrifice of his life."

Another misconception that exists in many minds, though it ought not to need correction, is the belief that New Testament criticism has succeeded in finding for us in the gospel narrative, especially that of the three earlier gospels, a Christ who is a purely human figure that later became deified in Christian devotion. There could hardly be a greater mistake concerning Christian origins. The Christ of the gospels is not a purely human figure ; criticism has not simplified the problem of His personality in the least. We have to remember, too, that it is the Christ of the greater Epistles with whom we have to deal before we come to the Christ of the gospels at all ; and the Christ of the Epistles is a divine being. At no point in the New Testament can we get behind the experience of the primitive Church in this respect. From

the first, or at least from the resurrection onward, Christ is adored as one in whom dwelt all the fullness of the Godhead bodily. The belief was not formulated in precise terms, but it was there. As Rudolf Otto puts it for us in his striking book, *The Idea of the Holy*, it is clear that the first disciples were conscious of the presence of something divine in their Master, "otherwise it would be unintelligible how the Church could have come into existence at all." The same writer states emphatically that the question whether the primitive Church did or did not so experience Christ is not so important as whether we can still do so, and he adds: "If something eternal, something holy, ever results from the blending and inter-penetration of rational and non-rational, purposive and indefinable elements . . . in the person of Jesus this stands as nowhere else potently and palpably apparent. . . . If there is a God and if He chose to reveal Himself, He could do it no otherwise than thus."

In citing this testimony let me remind you again that what gave rise to the unformulated but none the less confident witness of the apostolic Church to the Deity of Christ was not the fact primarily of His prophetic office, but of His Saviourhood. The gospel that the first Christian evangelists believed themselves commissioned to proclaim was before all else a gospel of salvation; and it was because of this that they preached Christ as more than man, though the time had not yet come for thinking out the full implications of their faith in Him.

But now we come to the very heart of the problem as it presents itself to the mind of to-day. How

can a man have the consciousness of Deity ; how is it reasonably possible for a Galilean peasant, sharing in the limitations of the knowledge of His time, to partake of the eternal and unconditioned Being who is the author and sustainer of all the world of worlds ? On the face of it the proposition seems an absurdity, which no doubt is the reason why so many contemporary attempts are being made to short-circuit the difficulty by declaring that Christ is only divine as the revealer of God and not God Himself. To the early Church the difficulty was not quite the same. The men who built the Christian Creed saw that Creator and creation could not be identified ; the eternal and all-perfect could not be subject to change and pain and death. They were right so far as human reason can see ; so in the end they had frankly to accept the contradiction and put the two incompatibles together in one confession of faith. Christ crucified might be to the Jew a stumbling-block and to the Greek foolishness, but to those who were being saved He was the power of God and the wisdom of God.

We have to follow the same method as the Christian thinkers of the first four centuries in our approach to a solution of this most vital of all religious problems. Who was Jesus Christ ? Historical criticism has shown that He was so truly human as to be ignorant like ourselves concerning many things, His knowledge was the knowledge of His time and race ; He wondered, mourned, wept, agonized ; He grew as we grow, learned as we learn, was tempted as we are tempted, died as we die. How could all this be true of God ? The facts only need to be stated for the inherent inconsistency to become plain and open.

Just so, but we are compelled to realize that it is an inconsistency which is not confined to our thought about the person and life of Jesus ; it is rooted in the very fact that there is a Universe at all. The world, says Dr. Whitehead, lives by the incarnation of God in itself. Yet nothing is more impossible for thought than the task of relating in a coherent whole finite and infinite, temporal and eternal, changeful and abiding. We have to grasp the nettle, admit the mystery, and say, These are to our perceptions fundamentally distinct, but must be a harmony and somehow a unity nevertheless. This conclusion is a necessity of thought ; the mind cannot find rest in anything short of it. The incarnation of God in Christ is the point in history where this realization is brought to a focus. Only in the affirmation that in Him the eternal and uncreate have become manifest under human conditions can Christian experience articulate itself fully and satisfactorily. Nothing short of this will do ; it would always leave something unsaid, something that the Christian soul feels and knows concerning our relations with our ever-living Lord.

Nor is this a mere confession of helplessness in presence of a mystery to which we have no solution. The mystery is not impenetrable. Bishop Temple argues in *Christus Veritas* that every man, being individual, can only estimate values from his own individual point of view and not from the universal. Only God can do the latter. How, then, can God enable a particular and finite creature to live in terms of what is universal and infinite ? There are only two ways. The first is by indwelling the man. This,

we know, is what the Divine Spirit actually does, but it has the disadvantage of either making the man an automaton or of becoming one influence among others. The second and higher way is that whereby God lives a human life Himself from a particular and finite centre. This is what took place in the incarnation of our blessed Lord. If to be human is to experience the universal in the particular, then Jesus was human as we are human, but with this difference, that He did not err in His perception of and fidelity to the values that are supreme and real and eternal. In this He was not hindered by His limitations of knowledge, for certitude concerning spiritual values is one thing and knowledge of facts and events is another. Were it otherwise, the wise and understanding would inherit the Kingdom of Heaven before the meek and the pure in heart. As Professor Leonard Hodgson suggestively states in his recently published work, *And Was Made Man*: "In the Gospels we find the picture of One who through all His human life shared the mind of His Father, who indeed, though He was perfectly human, looked out upon the world with the eyes of God." I cannot agree with all Professor Hodgson's eschatological conclusions, but in this passage I think he sums up for us in the simplest terms what is essential to faith in the Incarnation. It is a statement of the case with which neither philosophy, nor psychology, nor historical criticism, can have any quarrel.

The world has only looked upon true humanity once, and that was in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. For the rest of us the hope is that we may grow up into Him, our living Head. We need not, therefore,

inquire too narrowly what was human in Him and what divine. Few competent theologians now feel it worth while so to do. To call the human "Create" and the divine "Uncreate" explains nothing. It is sufficient for us to realize that in the perfect humanity of Christ we have learned to read the nature of God—nay, more, that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. With this proclamation Christianity began; and nothing less than this will ever suffice to draw mankind to the feet of the world's Redeemer.

THE FALL AND THE ATONEMENT

BY THE REV. N. P. WILLIAMS, D.D., LADY MARGARET
PROFESSOR, OXFORD

FOR more than a thousand years "the doctrine of the Fall" has been synonymous in Western Christendom with St. Augustine's version of it, which in various forms is embodied in the confessional documents of all the chief Western Churches, Roman, Anglican, Protestant, and Reformed. Yet it is not too much to say that the impact of modern thought and knowledge has caused the whole Augustinian scheme to collapse like a house of cards. Educated Christians everywhere have now realized that the Genesis-story on which this theory was based is no more than an inspired saga, which contains no suggestion of a doctrine of "original sin"; that geology, biology and anthropology have banished the dream of a primitive state of Paradisal righteousness and perfection enjoyed by our first parents to the limbo of discarded fables; that even the vaguer and more elastic Pauline conception of the Fall on which St. Augustine's rigid dogma was built up cannot be proved to have been taught by Christ Himself, but was in all probability derived by St. Paul, and possibly by his instructors, directly from the speculations of Jewish Rabbis and apocalyptists. And the concep-

tion of "original guilt," inhering in all members of the race by virtue of their birth, and sufficient to doom personally innocent babes to eternal death for a sin which is *ex hypothesi* not their own, is one against which the modern religious consciousness has decisively revolted, and to which it is never likely to return. Nevertheless, the facts which this theory was intended to explain—the interior chaos and disharmony of human nature—the deep-seated stains of folly, ferocity and lust which spread throughout its warp and weft—the ape and tiger which lurk, imperfectly chained and by no means slain, in the subconsciousnesses of us all—are as much a matter of experience, and call as loudly for an explanation, as in the days of St. Paul and St. Augustine. "The evil that I would not, that I do . . . O miserable man that I am, who shall deliver me out of the body of this death?" is still the cry of the soul which has faced the facts of its own inner life. Those in whom the belief in the unqualified goodness of human nature and the unhampered freedom of the human will has survived that colossal explosion of cruelty and hate which we call the Great War may be recommended to study Professor Freud's latest book, *The Future of an Illusion*, in which the great founder of modern analytic psycho-therapy draws a terrible picture of human nature as it is, with its elemental impulses imperfectly co-ordinated, less than half-moralized and half-civilized, and an even more terrible picture of its future in the light of the decline of religion, which he regards as an illusion, though a beneficent and desirable one. The "evolutionist" explanation of sin, which exhibits the anti-social tendencies of

human nature as the survival of animal instincts once useful in the struggle for existence, but now anachronistic, is not really a solution of the problem of sin as it presents itself to the Christian, but merely a restatement of it in modern terms ; for it makes no effort to tell us why a good and loving God should have created a Universe in which such baneful anachronisms were inevitable. Stripped of its fantastic pictorial garb, the argument of the Maccabean Jews still stands fast—" Either God must be deemed to be the author of evil, or the evil which exists must be traceable to some primitive catastrophe, some revolt against His will, some declension from the glory, beauty and harmony of the ideal cosmos, as it must have been conceived in the Creator's mind." Such a retrospective inference, which argues back from the evil which actually exists to the hypothesis of an aboriginal catastrophe from which it has flowed, is for the Christian Theist far more cogent than the similar retrospective reasoning whereby some astronomers have inferred the prehistoric break-up of a great member of our solar system from the existence of the asteroids or minute fragments of matter which swim in space between the orbits of Mars and Jupiter ; for there is no reason in the nature of things why our solar system should have included precisely nine major planets and no minor ones, whereas there is every reason why God should not have shaped human nature in such a way that it would inevitably produce a standing proportion of drunkards, epileptics, criminals and imbeciles.

The exact nature of this primitive cosmic calamity is, and always must remain, unknown to us. The

deep streak of moral evil which seems to run through sub-human nature, and is reflected in the ruthless ferocity of the struggle for existence, seems to suggest that the fontal source of evil in man and brute lies far back beyond the point of their differentiation ; and we may, if we will, conceive the ultimate Fall on the lines of a fall of spiritual beings, such as was imagined by the author of the Slavonic Enoch, and portrayed in epic verse by Milton ; or greater probability may seem to attach to a hypothesis which, following hints given by Plotinus, Gregory of Nyssa, and Coleridge, I have ventured to suggest in my Bampton Lectures on this subject—that of a pre-mundane rebellion and self-vitiation of the general Soul. But the exact nature of the Fall does not matter ; what matters is the fact of " fallenness." If the phenomena summed up in the term " original infirmity " (which I venture to think preferable to the term " original sin," as being free from the implication that we are individually responsible for our hereditary constitution) be realities, then the affirmation that there *was* a Fall of some kind is merely another way of saying that whoever else may be responsible for the ancestral curse which haunts human kind, like the fabled Erinys which haunted the houses of Atreus and Laius, the Almighty and loving Creator is not. The idea of " original infirmity," of an inbred hypertrophy of appetite and anæmia of will, marks the parting of two roads which lead to widely different conceptions of religion, and of Christianity in particular. If Pelagius was right, and if " original infirmity " be nothing but a monkish delusion, then redemption is stripped of its mystery

and becomes a matter of moral education, social reform, and other agencies which appeal directly to the conscious intellect ; and the figure of Jesus takes its place in the great line of ethical sages, Confucius, the Buddha, Socrates, who have at various times focused and formulated the highest human ideals and commended them through the purity of their own lives ; and that Death, which for centuries has kindled in the hearts of Christians thrilling emotions of awe and penitence and adoring love, becomes merely one of the great tragedies of history, which, for all their dramatic appeal, had, like the premature deaths of Mozart, of Shelley, and of the two Grenfell brothers in the Great War, so far as we can see, better not have happened. But if “ original infirmity ” be a fact—and I have suggested that the acutest non-Christian students of human nature are prepared to admit that it is—then its inevitable corollary is the idea of a purely supernatural redemption catastrophically breaking into human life from above, not merely illuminating that small area of our total personality which we call the conscious mind, but flooding the subconscious springs of action, taming crude passions, harmonizing elemental impulses, and bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. In the Catholic conception of the Incarnation, according to which the Christ is Himself the remedy for “ original infirmity,” dwelling in the hearts of His elect, mystically through the bestowal of the Holy Spirit, and sacramentally through the communication of His Body and His Blood, this idea finds its perfect fulfilment.

From this point of view, therefore—the point of

view given us by a revised and simplified conception of the Fall—it might seem as though the Atonement, the reconciliation of God and man, simply consisted in the Incarnation, and as though no special place were left for the Cross, which at first sight might appear to be no more than a pathetic, but otiose, tragedy. One solution of this difficulty is given us by the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews in two pregnant passages: “For it became Him for whom are all things, and through whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings.”¹ And again: “Who in the days of His flesh . . . though He was a Son, yet learned obedience by things which He suffered; and having been made perfect, He became unto all them that obey Him, the author of eternal salvation.”² Though our Lord’s human nature was at any given stage of His earthly life endowed with the perfection relative and appropriate to that stage, yet, if He was Very Man, it must have required effort on His part to lift Himself to the next stage; and it must therefore have required the supremest effort of which human powers are capable to raise Himself to that unconditioned perfection of human nature which enabled Him to burst the trammels and transcend the limitations of human individuality as we know it, so that even as Man He became a universal all-pervasive power capable of penetrating and healing millions of disordered souls in every age and clime. And the supremest moral achievement of which human nature is capable is the voluntary acceptance of death in obedience to

¹ Hebrews ii. 10.

² Ibid, v. 8.

duty. Viewed, therefore, in connection with what may be called the "therapeutic" or "medicinal" conception of Redemption, which arises out of the conception of the Fall, our Lord's Death and Dereliction upon the Cross were, not indeed the whole, but an inevitable part of the Atonement, because without them that self-perfection and universalization of His human nature, which were necessary in order to make it the medicine of immortality and the medium of the Spirit's impartation to us, could not have been achieved.

In this way, considered relatively to Christ's work in us, His Blood can still be spoken of as the "expiation" of our sins. For, the Hebrew and Greek words which in our English Bible are translated as "propitiation" really mean "expiation"; that is to say, they imply, not so much that God's disposition towards men is altered by the Atonement, or that He is changed from being an angry God into a loving God, but rather that man's sin is "expiated," that is, neutralized or cancelled, in such a way that the love which God eternally feels towards His creatures can flow forth without impediment or barrier. And Christ expiates sin in us by dwelling in us through His healing and sanctifying Spirit, so that when His beneficent work is complete, nothing will be left in us to shut out the sunlight of God's love and favour.

The train of thought which has just been sketched is that which is characteristic of St. John amongst New Testament writers, of the best thought of the Greek Fathers (in so far as it was not dominated by what we now feel to be the grotesque theory of Christ's

death as a ransom paid to the devil) and, in a broad general sense, of the writings of Bishop Westcott amongst nineteenth-century theologians. It will be noticed that it is concerned with the manward aspect of the Atonement, with Christ's work *in* us, rather than with His work *for* us, and also that it does not isolate the death of Christ from His Life, but thinks of the Death as the crowning instance of that obedience which was displayed in the Life. Yet any treatment of the subject of the Atonement must take into account its more mysterious Godward aspect, in which the Death alone assumes a unique significance, an aspect which rivets the attention of St. Paul and the author of Hebrews amongst New Testament writers, and of such spiritual kinsfolk of St. Paul as Augustine, Luther and Wesley. Many thinkers of this temperament have maintained that the objective, Godward, and satisfactoral element in the Atonement is more fundamental than its medicinal element, and that the work of Christ in us could not even have begun without His previous work for us. The ascription of a Godward aspect to the Atonement means, stated in the fewest possible words, that the Death of Christ was in some way the ground of the possibility of God's forgiveness of sin. It has, indeed, been denied by some modern thinkers that God needs any ground other than the sinner's own repentance; and it is claimed that, in the words of Wernle, "The one Parable of the Prodigal Son wipes all theories of sacrifice or vicarious atonement completely off the slate." I venture to think that this denial rests upon two fallacies, one exegetical and the other theological. We have no right to read negative implications into our Lord's

parables. The story of the Prodigal Son is doubtless meant to teach us the necessity of repentance as the "subjective" condition of forgiveness; but it is illegitimate to read into it an affirmation of the non-necessity of any deeper and more "objective" ground. And the contention that, because a good-natured man is prepared to forgive an injury on the basis of a mere apology, therefore God must be supposed to act in the same way, seems to assume a somewhat anthropomorphic conception of God. As a great philosopher has reminded us, the Catholic Faith tells us that there are three Persons *in* God, but it does not tell us that God is Himself a Person. If God be the source and ground of all that is, the infinite essence of Deity must be supra-personal, exalted far above the limitations of personality as we know it. God is ultimate Reality, timeless Being, unalterable law; what wonder, then, that in that inmost nature of things which is so far beyond our ken there should be rooted a principle, the operations of which are testified to by our daily experience—the mysterious principle of a compensation or moral balance in the Universe, which automatically ensures that sooner or later, somewhere and somehow, sin must be paid for, and will not merely be overlooked or ignored. At any rate, it cannot be denied that to repudiate any kind of objective or satisfactional view of the Atonement is to repudiate the authority of the great apostolic writers—St. Paul, St. Peter, the authors of the Epistle to the Hebrews and of the Apocalypse—as interpreters of the mind of Christ. "I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scrip-

tures.”¹ “We thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died”²—“Him who knew no sin He made to be sin on our behalf”³—“Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law, having become a curse for us”⁴—“Who His own self bare our sins in His body upon the tree”⁵—these and many other like sayings must, on the hypothesis just mentioned, be condemned as morbid exaggerations: and two of the great *motifs* of New Testament Christology—the identification of our Lord with the “suffering Servant” of Deutero-Isaiah, which dominated the thought of the primitive community, as depicted in the Acts of the Apostles, and the Platonizing representation of Him as the ideal High-Priest, entering in through His own Blood once for all into the supersensible Holy Place, as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews—cease to have any intelligible meaning. Those who are prepared to jettison so completely the teaching of the New Testament have naturally found it necessary to eliminate from the authentic sayings of Christ, by what I must needs think a purely arbitrary criticism, the great Words about the Life of the Son of Man given as a ransom for many,⁶ and the poured-out sacrificial blood which consecrates God’s new covenant with His people.⁷

Churchmen, therefore, who adhere to the authority of the Apostles, who are convinced that Christianity is more than a highly refined form of liberal Judaism, and includes elements of awe and mystery which cannot be completely rationalized or comprehended

¹ 1 Cor. xv. 3. ² 2 Cor. v. 14. ³ 2 Cor. v. 21.

⁴ Gal. iii. 13. ⁵ 1 Pet. ii. 24. ⁶ Mark x. 45.

⁷ Matt. xxvi. 28 = Mark xiv. 24; 1 Cor. xi. 25.

within the hard categories of physical science, will continue to believe that the Death of Christ has a unique efficacy and power in the intelligible or transcendental world, and that Christendom has not erred in choosing the Cross, rather than the picture of the Holy Mother and Child, as its distinctive and sufficient symbol. But, as the moon has one face perpetually turned towards our earth, so that we can descry in it continents and mountain ranges, and another face eternally hidden from us, for ever looking out into the deeps of space, so we must expect that, whilst the "therapeutic" or manward aspect of the Atonement is capable of a certain limited measure of comprehension and description, its satisfactoral or Godward aspect must remain veiled in almost impenetrable mystery. Certain gleams of light seem to have come to us in the long process of theological reflection and speculation upon the mystery. We cannot now believe that God took pleasure in the sufferings of His Son, simply considered as sufferings; it was the dedication of Christ's will expressed in the acceptance of those sufferings which availed to redeem mankind. This position has been summed up once and for all in the great saying of St. Bernard: "*Non mors, sed sponte morientis voluntas placuit deo.*" And, if the view of the Fall indicated at the beginning of this paper be well founded, the Atonement was a satisfaction not for "original sin" so-called (for that is merely a disease and not a crime), but solely for actual sin, individual and collective. Those who can realize even one tithe of the terrible content of the phrase, "the sins of the whole world," will not think that this is to minimize the glory of our Lord's redeem-

ing work. Yet precisely because the Atonement on its Godward side has to deal with "guilt," that is to say, with the moral quality or value attaching to the free actions of autonomous agents, theological speculation, when it endeavours to peer into that aspect of the mystery which is turned away from us and towards God, finds itself in a rarefied atmosphere in which the powers of the logical understanding faint and fail us. For logic deals with essences, substances, and quantities; not with values, which are only apprehensible by intuition or the mystical faculty in us: "spiritual things" are "spiritually discerned." In this lofty region we must be content to see as in a mirror darkly, and (in Canon Streeter's penetrating phrase) to avail ourselves of pictures where we cannot attain to the possession of diagrams. And the creative artists of the spiritual life have left us a gallery of great pictures, each one of which embodies one aspect of the ineffable meaning of Christ's work for us, and all of which, taken together, convey to our hearts a massive composite impression of that which eludes the clumsy grasp of the intellect. The eternal Priest of the Epistle to the Hebrews, who sprinkles the heavenly mercy-seat with His own Blood; the mystic Lamb of the Apocalypse; the Son who in the thought of Anselm makes satisfaction for the injured honour of His Father and Sovereign; the innocent victim of specifically Reformation theology, who vicariously suffers the punishment which should have been borne by the guilty; the representative Man portrayed by McLeod Campbell and Moberly, who precisely because He is sinless can make a perfect act of penitence on behalf of sinful humanity

—all these pictures have their place and their use, considered as symbolic representations of the transcendent Fact, and all alike break down into contradictions if analysed as though they were geometrical diagrams or mathematical formulæ.

Physical science, at least, which (as the President of the British Association has told us) is compelled for some purposes to imagine light as a series of waves, and for others as a stream of particles, is not in a position to cast the first stone at theology for employing diverse and even discrepant pictorial representations of realities inaccessible to sense.

If past experience affords any guidance in predicting the future, we need never expect that with our present faculties we shall be able to construct a single, logically coherent and luminously self-explanatory concept within the limits of which the unsearchable riches of Christ may be packed and confined. The most permanent gain that Christian thought can derive from poring on this most abstruse side, the Godward side, of the Atonement is an intensified sense of the shame and horror of actual sin, which had to be paid for by the suffering of God Himself. Bishop Gore has told us, in unforgettable words: "There will be no revival of vital religion among us on any large scale or with any adequate results, except through a deepening of the sense of sin: through a return to the properly Christian severity of view about the meaning of sin and its consequences." To that return the Cross, uplifted between earth and heaven, is the signpost which points the way.

THE UNIFORMITY OF NATURE AND THE FREEDOM OF MAN

BY THE RT. REV. THE LORD BISHOP OF BIRMINGHAM

THE seventeenth century resembled the twentieth in that each began with a splendid succession of scientific discoveries. The natural result of an increase in knowledge is a change in men's outlook, and consequently it is usually followed by attempts to create new philosophic systems. In the seventeenth century Descartes used the new knowledge of his era as the basis of a philosophic system which for long was of great influence. In essence his system was rigidly mechanical, and he applied it not only to the inorganic world but also to the world of life. Thus he regarded animals as automata : he believed that all their actions were the consequences of a rigid mechanism. To humanity he allowed the possession of an immaterial soul. Man thus differed from the animals and escaped that subjection to the rule of law by which they were bound. Of course, much in Descartes' system now seems to us fantastic. In particular, he imagined that the soul of man was especially associated with the pineal gland. This structure in the brain is, as physiologists are now agreed, a vestigial eye : Descartes erroneously thought that it was not to be found in animals. In a popular

and debased form Descartes' system held its own until late in the nineteenth century : most intelligent people believed in a reign of natural law from control by which man was partially exempt because he possessed a soul with which the animals had not been endowed. Then came the transformation of ideas which we owe to Darwin. Whatever criticisms may be advanced against the particular mechanism of evolution for which he argued, Darwin conclusively demonstrated, in Professor Arthur Thomson's words, "man's similarity with the rest of creation, his affiliation to a mammalian stock." The sharp differentiation between man and the higher vertebrates which Descartes had postulated thus proved untenable. There are undoubtedly traces, and more than traces, of rational thought even in the less developed vertebrates. Different though man undoubtedly is from the animals from which he has been derived, this difference expresses itself through his spiritual and moral faculties ; it cannot be so stressed as to deny that animals possess mind. If they have no free-will, neither has man. If man has free-will, so have they. The change in popular thought among us during the last two generations shows a full realization of such truth. Hence it has become urgently necessary that Christian philosophers should examine the implications of man's kinship with lower forms of life, more especially in connection with such problems as the freedom of the will and personal immortality.

It has been justly said that the intelligence of humanity is a defective instrument for creating a philosophy of the Universe, because it has presumably

developed in special directions as a consequence of natural selection. Evidently any hominoid or primitive man who failed to recognize the existence in nature of those uniformities which we commonly term natural law was likely to have a short life. One does not need to formulate the law of gravitation to realize the probable result of a fall from the bough of a tree. Moreover, with the development of civilization the importance of the sequences of nature becomes greater rather than less. A primitive community which refuses to believe that harvest follows seed-time is likely to starve. Thus, owing to our ancestral history there is a natural tendency in humanity to attach full, if not exaggerated, importance to the so-called laws of nature. Together with this tendency, there was naturally associated in primitive thought a belief that the exceptional man, the divinely inspired leader, could set aside natural laws. This belief in special powers endured so long as the sequences of phenomena were ill understood. It is only in quite modern times that disbelief in the possession of such abnormal powers over nature has become general.

Such disbelief towards the close of the nineteenth century was associated, in the teaching of a group of scientific men of whom Huxley was the outstanding representative, with the doctrine that human free-will was illusory. The belief arose (it was expounded with great sincerity and ability) that, given sufficient knowledge of precedent physical circumstances, the actions of man could be predicted as certainly as the positions of the planets. It was admitted that such precedent knowledge as was necessary for this kind

of prediction was unobtainable, and further, that it must include the disposition of the atoms of the brain. But none the less, it was confidently assumed that scientific discovery would increasingly reveal new sequences in nature, and that ultimately the purely physical causes of human action would become clear.

Herbert Spencer, in his *Autobiography*, recorded one aspect of the Victorian outlook with naïve confidence.

“It seems,” he says, “as though I knew by intuition the necessity of equivalence between cause and effect—perceived without teaching, the impossibility of an effect without a cause appropriate to it, and the certainty that an effect, relevant in kind and quantity to a cause, must in any case be produced.”

He thus came to regard as impossible everything conceived as contrary to the causality of nature.

In connection with such a standpoint it is of fundamental importance to analyse the notion of cause. Only after reflection does one begin to discover how difficult it is to define cause adequately. Our own experience naturally makes us ascribe *efficient* causation to natural phenomena. When we do things we are conscious of a feeling of endeavour, and we naturally ascribe to the sequences of nature some like quality which binds the effect to the cause. Hume, however, made it clear that the conception of efficient causation is neither necessary nor useful in natural science. So far as the principle of causation is retained in science, it must be as a working hypothesis by which we assume that we can predict the occurrence of certain events when some definite grouping of antecedent events is known. We must not, therefore, import the idea of logical necessity into what

we describe as cause and effect in nature. Natural science does not explain the intrinsic nature of the sequences which it describes : it tells us how things happen, but not in the ultimate resort why they happen. Furthermore, such sequences of phenomena by their very nature have in themselves nothing purposive or teleological. We cannot legitimately conclude from a knowledge of any of them that the succession of cause and effect is part of a general plan with a definite objective. Now I personally find plain evidence of purpose in that prolonged development of life upon the earth which has culminated in the creation of man ; I do not therefore think that we can expect to discover from the mechanisms of natural science that knowledge of things as they really are which some men of science assert that we can thus obtain.

It is well known that in natural science we do not get the notion of causation unless there is a certain contingency attaching to the so-called cause of an event. For instance, day regularly follows night, but we cannot therefore say that night is the cause of day or *vice versa*. Helmholtz, who speculated deeply on these matters, affirmed that the principle of causality was none other than the hypothesis that all the phenomena of nature are ordered according to law. But Helmholtz' statement is not wholly satisfactory. In the notion of causality, as commonly accepted, a knowledge of the past is sufficient to determine the governing law ; yet it is possible to frame laws of behaviour which cannot always be determined without knowledge of future behaviour. Thus there are purely mechanical sequences which

resemble those commonly regarded as belonging exclusively to the sphere of mental action. Let me give an illustration. It is possible to imagine an Archbishop who has pursued a steady course of orthodoxy suddenly for a month lapsing into the Monophysite heresy, and then at the end of the month recapturing his orthodoxy and retaining it unsullied for the rest of his life. A complete analogy to such conduct can be exhibited as a deterministic system. Hobson has explained in his Gifford Lectures on *The Domain of Natural Science* that it is possible to give a single formula by which the position of a particle can at any time be calculated, though that particle in the middle, as it were, of uniform motion in a straight line suddenly describes a semi-circle (it is to be understood that the particle ends its course with its initial uniform motion in the same straight line as that in which it began). Obviously, between the action of the particle and the action of the imaginary Archbishop there is complete correspondence ; and it would have been impossible to calculate the aberration of either from a knowledge of his or its course before such aberration began.

The limited nature of the sequences which constitute what is commonly called the uniformity of nature should be carefully observed. In obtaining them we usually disregard all that is individual in the things with which we deal. Our so-called laws are deduced by the operations of accurate measurement ; they therefore only apply to things of which we have *quantitative* knowledge. We perforce ignore *qualities* which are not amenable to such measurement. It may be said with some truth that there are cer-

tain qualities whose physical manifestations we can measure ; and that we can therefore bring these qualities within the realm of natural law. But none the less our knowledge is ultimately a knowledge of certain pointer-readings which we can observe ; and we must insist that it leaves us absolutely ignorant of the essential nature of the things which we measure. Thus, as Eddington has well said, " there is nothing to prevent the assemblage of atoms forming the brain from being itself a thinking-machine in virtue of that nature which physics leaves undetermined and undeterminable." In short, physics has discovered certain connections between the things with which it deals, but the intrinsic essence of those things lies outside its province. In other words, natural science consists of the formulation of conceptual relations between percepts : in so far as these conceptual relations have a predictive power, they are useful to us ; more than that we cannot legitimately claim.

The preceding reflections, if they are accepted, have two consequences. On the one hand, they narrow the domain of natural science ; on the other, they reveal the extent to which the mind creates the so-called realm of natural law. In consequence, they certainly make us doubt whether human actions, which are the result (as most of us believe) of the working of the mind, can be brought within any such realm. It is, of course, possible to argue that our free-will is an illusion and that all our actions are determined not by mental decisions, but by physico-chemical or bio-chemical causes. I confess that to myself it is a fantastic hypothesis that, let us say, the criticisms which this paper may receive from some

ecclesiastical controversialist should be determined, not by the ideas which I am putting before you, but by material causes like the arrangement of the molecules in his brain due to the print which he reads. I do not, of course, pretend to be able to explain the relation of mind and body, and I confess that none of the many theories which have been put forward are free from objection. But it seems to me that the physical and psychical worlds are in truth only different aspects of a single unity. Einstein has made most thoughtful people aware that space and time are artificial constructions by which the human mind breaks up a single unity, space-time. We in like manner observe embodied minds: personality, as we know it, is partly physical and partly psychical. Body and mind are not separately given to our experience. If this two-aspect theory, as it is commonly called, be adopted, it is, I must concede, difficult to realize in what way the physical side of the unity can belong to a mechanistic system, complete in itself, while the psychical side is not so limited. In fact, it must be allowed that the influence of mind in the physical world may to some extent modify any mechanistic schemes which we may accept as valid for physico-chemical processes.

We are, I must confess, at the present time confronted by two unsolved and at present insoluble problems. In the first place, we cannot understand how mental processes can affect physical events. In the second place, assuming that the mind has an influence in the physical world, we cannot explain why the laws of that world appear to form a closed system.

As a way out of the first difficulty, many have assumed that there is associated with mind some "vital force." Those who make this hypothesis, however, have never been able to point to any definite process in which such vital force discloses its activity. The progress of bio-chemistry reveals a marvellously complex set of physico-chemical processes, but apparently these are all expressible as sequences in the inorganic realm and need no extraneous factor to explain how they take place. This is not to say that by the concepts of physics and chemistry we can completely explain all biological processes. The duplication of the fertilized germ-cell remains a mystery. The biologist who sees such duplication taking place under a microscope is in the presence of what von Uexküll calls organization according to plan, and such organization cannot be thought of merely in terms of mechanism. The whole operation of cell-division is a "super-mechanical process." The analogy of the unfolding of a framework is, as Driesch showed, entirely unconvincing. A framework is made of parts fitted together: when one tears it asunder, it is a framework no longer. If there were such an invisible framework present in the germ, it would be cut into two when the germ was halved. Driesch showed that the result of halving a germ-cell was, if it developed, the production not of two half-animals but of two perfect animals, each of half the normal size. Von Uexküll imagines that the genes in the germ-cell have the power to convert an extra-spatial and extra-temporal plan into a physical phenomenon. He speaks of their activating certain ferments which thus cause the observed changes in the germ. I

cannot myself believe that his theory escapes the objections which can be brought against all types of vitalism. It assumes some sort of psychical influence over material things, and this was effectively satirized half a century ago by W. K. Clifford, the first Englishman to realize the importance of Riemann's theory of space. Clifford compared such theories of "mental force" to the belief that the wagons of a railway train are held together by the friendly feeling of the engine-driver for the guard. A solution of our difficulties must, as I have indicated, come through a recognition of the fact that mind and body are not separate entities; they are two aspects of a single unity whose nature we do not at present understand.

But even if we could understand the interaction of mind and matter, there would still remain the problem as to how mental action could influence the course of events in physical systems which are apparently complete in themselves. Some of our philosophers with an inadequate mathematical equipment seem to be satisfied with the idea that the will may exercise a sort of guiding power in changing certain crucial directions without interfering with the great principle of the conservation of energy. It is easy, in support of such a position, to point to the existence of guiding constraints which do no work, though they crucially affect the safe launching of a great ship. But all such contentions fail to satisfy the mathematical physicist. It is certainly possible that the mind does no work when it interferes with a physical system, and that therefore mental decisions do not upset the law of conservation of energy. But, none the less, if the mind has any effect at all in the physical universe,

the dynamical system of which we may imagine that universe to consist will cease to be self-contained. In other words, it will no longer function in accordance with the established laws of dynamics. Somewhere or another there will be an action to which there corresponds no reaction, and consequently Newton's third law of motion will not hold good.

Out of the dilemma thus created no one has so far suggested a satisfactory mode of escape. Certain consequences which can be deduced from Einstein's general theory of relativity seem to indicate that some of the great laws of physics are disguised identities and therefore do not affect freedom of action. This appears to be true, for instance, of the law of gravitation : it does not limit the possibility of human action because violation of it is inconceivable. Professor Weyl, the great exponent of Einstein's discovery, has said, in his book, *Space, Time, Matter* : " Freedom of action in the world is no more restricted by the rigorous laws of field physics than it is by the validity of the laws of Euclidean geometry according to the usual view." What this means is best understood by an analogy. If Euclid's geometry be true, it is impossible to draw on a flat sheet of paper a circle of which the circumference shall be exactly three times the diameter. None the less, we do not regard such impossibility as limiting our freedom to draw what we like.

If the great field-laws of physics are disguised identities, the fact affords an escape from part of our dilemma. But these laws do not embrace the whole of those which govern the physical realm. There are in addition statistical laws which express the

behaviour of crowds or swarms of objects. If the mind can act on the atoms or electrons which belong to any such swarms, it is clear that it must influence the behaviour of the crowd, and that it therefore must modify the statistical law which expresses such behaviour. So far no such result of the influence of the mind on statistical laws has been discovered. Until it is discovered we have no conclusive answer to those who assert that human consciousness is but a by-product of chains of phenomena in the physical world which it is powerless to influence.

This conclusion will doubtless be disconcerting to some here who would have desired, if they did not expect, that I should tell them that it had become scientifically impossible for anyone to maintain to-day the mechanistic determinism which is commonly described as materialism. In excuse I can only plead that in speaking to you on such a subject to-day I must conform to the attitude of a man of science. It has been well said that "the great scientist is he who keeps clear of fanaticism and crankiness by continuous moral effort, by effacing his own peculiarities, wishes, desires and interests in order to get as unbiased a view as possible of the facts."

Yet great physicists and the progress of physical science itself give us reason to think that, as knowledge extends and crucial experiments are devised, human consciousness will be proved to interfere in the apparently closed systems of physical phenomena. Weyl says that "physics at its present stage can in nowise be regarded as lending support to the belief that there is a causality of physical nature which is founded on rigorously exact laws." And I would remind you

that, in including the doctrine of conservation of mass within the more general principle of conservation of energy, physicists are now agreed that their old-time measurements were at fault in that they could not detect the mass or weight of heat-energy lost in combustion.

Perhaps you will permit me in conclusion briefly to relate what I have said to two other problems of surpassing interest to all who accept the Christian outlook upon life. I have indicated that, as it seems to me, we cannot separate mind and body in man: they are two aspects of a single unity. How, then, it may be asked, can we continue to believe in the existence of human personality after bodily death? I would answer that our belief in the survival of human personality is bound up with our conception of the nature of God. If we accept Christ's view of God, we cannot believe that He will allow anything of value in His Universe to be destroyed; and we can confidently claim that in general the spirit of man is of such value as to be worthy of preservation. How man's spirit or personality will be preserved we cannot say: shall we not be content with St. Paul's confident hope that God will give it a body? I would urge that in this matter our difficulties are no greater than those difficulties with regard to the whole of the future life which the doctrine of relativity has brought into clear relief. A generation ago, it was customary to say that Heaven was a state and not a place, the implication being that the life after death was temporal and not spatial. Einstein has, however, demonstrated that space and time form a single complex which we arbitrarily break up in our

thought. We have no right to postulate that in the world to come part of this complex will be destroyed while the other part remains intact. In fact, with regard to space and time in the Kingdom of Heaven very much the same difficulties arise as with regard to body and personality. In neither case can natural science give effective guidance.

The other matter to which I would briefly allude concerns the evolution of human personality. It seems to me, as I have said, that we must grant that all the higher faculties of man had their beginnings in lower forms of life. We can trace in the past history of life upon this earth a vast sequence of progressive change. But I think that throughout this change we must recognize creative activity; and, further, such creative activity is not from within, the result of an innate urge or of some life-force trying to express itself. The source of such activity is outside the organism, and it shows itself in the mutations or inheritable variations which, as it appears, constantly arise in the chromosomes of the germ-cell. It seems, moreover, that mental characters, which are closely correlated with brain structure, are inherited in exactly the same way as bodily characters; and that their development has been by a series of mutations whose origin is to be found in the divine purpose which runs through all creation. In fact, it is God that hath made us, and not we ourselves. There are many men of science who would say that we have no right to import into the evolutionary scheme, which biologists describe, such ideas as spiritual activity or divine purpose. In the processes which biology describes such ideas, it may be rightly

contended, have no place ; but when we seek to understand these processes as a whole and to find a clue not only to the intrinsic nature of the processes themselves, but also to the existence and powers of the human beings who have resulted from their operation, then I would urge that in all we must see the action of the divine Father of Christ's revelation.

CRITICISM AND THE AUTHORITY OF THE BIBLE

BY THE REV. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, D.D., STUDENT
AND TUTOR OF CHRIST CHURCH ; LECTURER IN BIBLICAL
STUDIES IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

THE Bible consists of a collection of books which the Church—Jewish and Christian—has canonized. Canonization—the setting apart of these particular books so as to constitute what is described as a “canon,” or “rule,” of Holy Scripture—implies certainly that the Church ascribes to the books in question some kind of authority. Canonized books are invested with sacredness. They are described as being “holy.” They are held to possess “numinous” quality. They are believed to be “inspired.”

Considered from another point of view, the books of the Bible constitute what may be described as the classical documents of Jewish and Christian religious faith. They are, for Christians, the record, the deposit in writing, of a progressive process of Divine self-revelation, a revelation which was wrought out in history. It is a process which has its beginning not later than the beginnings of Judaism (if it does not indeed begin earlier), and its culmination in the manifestation of God incarnate in man, in the

Lord Jesus Christ. From the point of view of full Christian faith, the Divine Word—the Self-utterance of God—is supremely Christ Jesus. But there is a sense also in which the Bible, too, has been traditionally described as God's Word. It has been called "the Word of God written." It consists, no doubt, of the words of men. We may say of it, if we will, that it contains and expresses the Word of God, but in the form and through the medium of the words of men. It is in any case clear that a collection of books of which this may be said with truth deserves to be seriously studied.

And serious study means criticism; for the word "criticism" denotes simply "judgment"; and we are to use our best judgment in reading the Bible, as a biblical writer invites us to do. "I speak as to wise men" (so writes St. Paul); "judge ye what I say." In all ages of Christianity the best judgment of Christian minds has been brought to bear on the Bible. But there have been periods in which critical judgment has been hampered; and indeed it is only in quite recent times that the Bible has been studied by Christians with true critical freedom. There has been a real change in the last hundred years.

Traditionally, and in what may be described as the pre-critical period, the Bible was read by Christians not merely in the light of their faith, but in the light also of certain preconceived theories. It has been regarded too often as a kind of storehouse of infallibly guaranteed information. Because inspired, it has been held to be inerrant. It has been treated as though it were all on one level throughout, and

it has been not uncommonly used as an oracle, pronouncing with final authority upon all manner of questions of history, philosophy, and natural science, not to speak of theology. The real understanding of the Bible itself has been hampered by such a mode of treatment ; and apart from this, its supposed authority has been invoked to impede and fetter the progress of free investigation in respect of subject-matters quite outside its scope. From these mistakes of the past the minds of Christians to-day are in process of shaking themselves free ; and, indeed, in all educated circles the process has long been accomplished.

The change has been due in the main to what is known as the historical method. The Bible has come to be studied historically. It is no longer regarded virtually as though it had descended from heaven ready-made, like Melchizedek, without father or mother. It is studied in the light of what can be known or discovered as to the process of its origins, its gradual growth. The effort is being seriously made to read the various books of the Bible in relation to their times, and in the setting of their historical context. The actual writers, in the course of this process, have come to life. We may not in all cases know who they were ; but we regard them as human beings, with their various idiosyncrasies, their particular outlooks, and interests, and purposes. They are no longer regarded as having been merely the penmen of God. They are human, and correspondingly fallible, for all the inspired insight which—in varying degrees, and in respect of matters strictly religious—they are held to display.

In all this there is much that is pure gain. There is a freedom about modern historical study of the Bible which is frankly exhilarating. There is beyond question a gain in intelligibility, in strictly historical insight; and the understanding delights in the process. The way, moreover, is opened for a more adequate appreciation of the Bible as literature. The mind, being set free from the old bondage to the letter, is enabled to enter into the spirit of the various books, regarded simply as literature, in a wholly new way—a point which was made, rather more than a generation ago, by Matthew Arnold in *Literature and Dogma*. Freedom of spirit, intelligibility, historical insight, the appreciation of the Bible as literature—to these gains must be added, I think, the recognition of revelation as a *process*, the discrimination of levels, the fact that the Christian mind is no longer perplexed (as the minds of our forefathers were sometimes perplexed) by the discovery that the morality (for example) of certain parts of the Bible is not fully Christian, or that the theological outlook of certain of its writers is not fully mature.

But is the whole process sheer gain, unmixed gain? In the long run the answer, I think, must be “Yes”; for all truth is of God. But in the mean time there is no doubt that the minds of not a few are perplexed. The plain man does not know where he stands. He is at a loss what to believe.

There is, moreover, this justification for the state of mind of the plain man; that when once the appeal is made to free criticism—when once the applicability of the historical method is admitted—a great deal

which was formerly regarded as certain becomes involved in uncertainty. There are, strictly speaking, no absolute certitudes in history. The historical method yields only probabilities. The modern spirit is profoundly impressed with the sense both of the contingency and of the relativity of history, and the implications, for some minds, are sceptical. From the mere fact that there is nothing unquestioned, it is sometimes crudely concluded that all things are questionable. In a sense, no doubt, they are ; but not in the sense that there are no positive answers which may rightly be given. If I may make at this point a confession of personal faith, I am myself convinced, upon grounds which are at least partly historical, both that the Lord Jesus Christ, as an historical Person, once lived, and was the kind of Person portrayed in the Gospels, and that the Church, broadly speaking, has rightly interpreted His significance, rightly hailed Him as Lord, rightly worshipped Him as God. These conclusions, I say, are partly historical : they are not wholly so. They are in part, as I have already suggested, a confession of personal faith. There is a real sense in which "no man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." I believe, nevertheless, that what may be broadly described as the Christian interpretation of Christ is the truest, even from the point of view simply of history.

But I have stated the matter in broad terms. I wish expressly to recognize, and to emphasize the point, that when once the door has been opened to criticism, the details do become doubtful, and there is endless room for legitimate divergence of view.

Let me quote some words recently used by Dr. Edwyn Bevan.

“How different,” writes Dr. Bevan, “the problem of Jesus would be if we could go back to a belief in the infallible inspiration of the four Gospels ! There would be no question whether he did, or did not, claim to be the Messiah, to be a Divine being come down from heaven to give his life a ransom for men, to be one with the Father ; whether he did or did not walk on the sea and raise the dead ; whether his body did or did not rise reanimated on the third day from the grave and yield itself to be handled by the disciples. But once give up the infallible inspiration of the New Testament, and where are you ? Once begin to say that these four documents were written by men according to the ordinary processes of the human mind, author and date to be settled purely by considerations of ordinary historical probability, and you cannot stop short at any point. You must throw all the facts of the life of Jesus, all his sayings, his very personality, into the heap, for probability to sort out.”

And again : “So long as the belief in the verbal inspiration of our documents prevailed, it was perfectly reasonable for Christians to study the meaning of each particle in the reported words of our Lord ; but when once you suppose the report to have been made according to the laws of ordinary human psychology, it is absurd to discuss what Jesus meant by this or that clause. All you have is someone else's recollections years after (let us suppose St. Peter's) of what he understood at the time Jesus to say, and that reported by a third person (let us

suppose St. Mark), perhaps many years after he had heard St. Peter discourse, and translated from Aramaic into Greek.”¹

Dr. Bevan is perfectly right : that is the kind of difference which criticism does make, from the strictly historical point of view.

What becomes then (it may be asked) of the authority of the Bible ?

The answer is that, considered *historically*—that is to say, as a source-book for purely historical writing—the Bible carries no special kind or degree of authority ; it is to be judged and interpreted by ordinary historical canons. And from the point of view of a non-Christian or secular outlook, the Bible obviously carries with it no particular kind of authority at all. But the Bible is, and continues to be, authoritative for Christians, in so far as it can be rightly described as the Word of God, or the “ Word of God written.” In what sense can the Bible be rightly so described ?

Well, in the first place, from the point of view of Christianity the Bible occupies, as I have indicated already, a position which is altogether unique. It is of permanent and indispensable significance, as constituting (to recur to a phrase which I have used earlier) the classical literature of that progressive and specific process of Divine self-revelation in history which finds its crown and consummation in Jesus Christ. The Bible has been, and is, for the Christian Church the criterion—I would myself say the *primary* criterion,

¹ The quotations are from an address by Dr. Bevan to the Oxford Society of Historical Theology on “ Some Aspects of the Present Situation.”

and the indispensable touchstone and test—of its doctrine, in so far as its doctrine is Christian. This does not, of course, mean that Christian doctrine, in order to be Christian, must be expressed invariably in Biblical terms. There is a development in Christian thought, just as there is a development in Christian life, institutions, and practice. It is a false archaism which would attempt to live permanently in the period of the New Testament, thinking only New Testament thoughts, and behaving in narrowly New Testament ways. The full Christian faith includes faith in the Spirit, the *living* Spirit, in every age the inspiration and the Guide of the Church. Later developments, whether of life, doctrine, institutions, or worship, are not to be condemned, merely on the ground that they are not literally biblical. Nevertheless, there is a real sense in which later developments, if they are to be authentically Christian, require to be constantly tested and criticized by reference, not indeed to the letter, but to the spirit, of the biblical word. The norm of the biblical revelation serves, as I have said, as a touchstone and test, a criterion, of that which is genuinely Christian as distinguished from that which is simply non-Christian, or (it may be) sub-Christian, in faith, worship, and thought.

In the second place, I would say that the Bible, as the “Word of God written,” has authority for Christians as the chief source of guidance for religious and spiritual life. As the record of God’s supreme revelation it possesses authority just in so far as it speaks to us of Christ; and it vindicates this its authority in living Christian experience by continuing

to mediate, both to individual Christians and to the Christian Church corporately, the revelation which it records. It is a matter of sheer spiritual experience that countless millions of Christians have nurtured, and do nurture, their spiritual lives by the practice of spiritual meditation upon the Biblical word. Individuals doubtless have favourite passages, and there are certain parts of the Bible which are more obviously edifying than others. The whole Bible is the treasure of the Church, and (as a German writer remarks) "the authority of Holy Scripture must be grounded not merely in the experience of individuals but in the corporate experience of the Church . . . Much in the Bible which for this or that individual Christian, or indeed for whole generations of Christians, falls into the background or appears almost meaningless, has at other periods and times powerfully fostered the life of the spirit."¹

In all such spiritual use of the Bible it is necessary to use spiritual judgment. The successive stages of revelation are to be judged in relation to their historical climax, and in estimating the relative spiritual value of different portions of the Bible the standard is never anything other than the mind of Christ, as unfolded in the experience of the Church, and as appropriated to the individual Christian by His Spirit. "The things of the Spirit are spiritually discerned." The teaching of Luther is not specifically authoritative for Anglicans; but it is worth

¹ E. Riggenbach, *Die reformatorischen Schätze der heiligen Schrift in ihrer Bedeutung für die Gegenwart*, p. 21 (German original quoted by W. Vollrath, *Das Problem des Wortes*, p. 266).

while remembering that Luther—the great vindicator in modern Europe of the idea of the supremacy of the Biblical word—was himself, though, of course, no historical critic in the modern sense of those words, nevertheless not guilty of the worst and crudest extravagances of literalism. He did not baldly identify the Word of God with the letter of the Bible. What Luther held was that the Word of God was contained in, or expressed through, the Bible; that the Divine message spoke *through* the written word, and came home with power to the soul of the reader in proportion as it was spiritually confirmed by the *testimonium Spiritus sancti*—the witness of the Spirit within.

In all true spiritual reading of the Bible that is exactly what happens. It is a case of deep calling to deep. The last word is emphatically not with the historical method. The Divine Word, in so far as it is a self-revelation of the living God, has indeed, in a certain sense, its historical basis in Scripture, but in itself it is super-historical. It brings us directly into relation with God; and the living God, in so far as He speaks to us, whether through the medium of Scripture or otherwise, speaks Himself direct to the soul. That is what the saints have discovered. They have been reading the Scriptures; they have been meditating on the Biblical word; and upon a sudden the words have come to life, and there has been a stirring of the Spirit, so that their hearts burned within them; and through the medium of the biblical words God Himself has uttered to them His Word, and has spoken directly to their souls, and they have learned the great truth that “man

doth not live by bread alone, but by every word of God.”

Criticism, then (to sum up), in the sense of a purely literary and historical criticism, has brought with it great gains, side by side with what, from some points of view, might appear to be an immediate and temporary loss. Nevertheless, the supreme type of criticism is spiritual criticism—the exercise of a devout, trained, and intelligent spiritual judgment, a judgment illuminated and guided by the indwelling Spirit of God. It is our bounden duty to criticize, for we are bidden to exercise judgment ; and we are to criticize, therefore, the words of the Scripture. We are to criticize (as I once heard a great scholar remark) even the words of the Lord Jesus Himself. But we shall find, when we do criticize them, that His words, like the words of the Scriptures in general, are with power. For they rise up and criticize *us* ; and in the end our souls will be bowed down, in humility and penitence and awe, before the revelation of spiritual truth.

MIRACLES

BY THE REV. J. K. MOZLEY, D.D., WARDEN OF ST.
AUGUSTINE'S HOUSE, READING

CHRISTIANITY is the absolute, the final religion. It is this not simply or chiefly as the climax of the religious spirit in man, but as enshrining the fullness of revelation which God has given of Himself in the incarnation of His Son. No word describes this characteristic of Christianity so well as the word "supernatural." For, whatever objections may be brought against it, it lays stress on what has been the inspiration of Christian piety, worship, and character, on the overflowing richness of God's grace in history. It emphasizes the truth that nature as we know it or as we could ever know it, can neither determine nor explain nor justify the ways of God, and especially of the God who redeems. Only when the reality of this essential supernaturalism of Christianity is acknowledged, can there be a profitable examination of particular elements in Christianity.

In a recent book, entitled *The Faith that Rebels*, Dr. Cairns, Principal of the United Free Church College at Aberdeen, has used the word "stalemate" in respect of the present position of contrasted views concerning the miracles narrated in the Gospels. He means that no further advances can be made along

either traditional or Modernist lines. What he regards as the traditional conception of the miracles—that they were worked in order to demonstrate our Lord's divinity—seems to him to be a theory which the Gospels themselves do not justify. But he finds no satisfaction in the Modernist attitude. There is, he holds, no secure bridge of reconciliation between religion and science to be built on a basis of denial of the so-called "nature" or "cosmic" miracles. Traditionalists and Modernists may not accept as adequate Dr. Cairns' account of their respective positions. But be that as it may, some such re-examination of the question as Dr. Cairns desires, and himself offers, is needed.

The value of a new approach will depend very largely on its starting-point. Little help is to be found in a terminological discussion of the meaning of the word "miracle." If a definition is to be given, it is better to come to it rather than to start with it; better, that is, to follow the method adopted by the President of this Congress in his book, *The Miracles of the New Testament*, published some fourteen years ago. Can we, then, hope to reach a conclusion by the method of historical investigation? Here, in the New Testament, and, in particular, in the Gospels, are events to which the title "miracles" has been given. Shall we decide on the credibility of these events after a discussion of the reliability of the writers and the character of their sources? Such a method is certainly not without its value. But by itself it is inadequate. Historical investigation does not permit of sure conclusions on a subject which introduces other considerations than those

of a purely historical nature. We are concerned—and here, I think, everyone would be agreed—not simply with historical evidence, but with the relation of God to history. All that falls within the problem of that relationship cannot be solved by a study of documents. The judgment passed upon the documents will, to no small measure, depend upon the presuppositions with which the documents are approached. It will make a difference which none can overlook, whether we approach history with the belief that God is rightly describable as transcendent and free in relation to the historical process, or whether He is contained in the historical process in such a way as to be, in fact, exhausted in it. This latter position is that of the Italian Neo-Idealists. There is no priority of God to history, any more than there is to nature. The Incarnation becomes, in the words of Ruggiero, “the eternal truth of human life and history,” but no special importance attaches to the Person of Jesus. Belief in miracle, as we meet with miracle in the Gospels, may be theoretically reconcilable with such absolute immanentism; but there can be no real doubt that when the significance of the Jesus of history disappears in a theology of this kind, the problem of His mighty works will be solved by the denial of their reality. In so far as any of them are still affirmed, their interest will be wholly psychological, and not in any way theological.

What, then, of the old battlefield of religion and science and its relevance for the question of miracles? In the form in which, as I suppose, it largely presented itself to men’s minds two generations ago it was an unreal battlefield. It would have been

real, only if Naturalism as a philosophy had been the true child of scientific research. Then, indeed, miracles, and much more than miracles, would have been in sore straits faced with a close-locked world-order, the materialistic interpretation of mental phenomena, and the structure, functions and beauty of the Universe simply the revelation of a mindless, purposeless machine. But Naturalism fell on evil days, and though its echoes may still be heard, as, for instance, in arguments on the subject of "Where are the dead?" it seems very unlikely that it will attain even to earthly immortality. Still, it is the sense of a need for replying to naturalistic world-views in their bearing upon the question of miracle, world-views which are, of course, centuries older than the philosophy of Naturalism which we connect with nineteenth-century biological discoveries, which keeps in being the Augustinian apologetic, that miracle is not contrary to nature, but to nature as we know it. From this proceeds the positive side of this apologetic: miracle is not "*contra naturam*" but "*super naturam*," and in it is revealed a higher law. This apologetic gained a good deal of popularity, but I very much doubt whether it deserved to do so. The idea of higher law seems too much like a way of escaping from a difficulty. What is the character of this higher law? Law in nature means orderly sequence. Law is not something given: it is a word of interpretation which follows upon a process of description. One can interpret the sequences only by passing beyond sequence to cause; and at that point the scientific investigator moves right out of his province. The easy misuse of the term "law,"

when it is forgotten that, as a word of interpretation, it expresses our interpretation of sequences, makes the use of the phrase "higher law" very questionable. Moreover, it suggests that the secret of miracles lies in undiscovered sequences belonging to the natural order which may in time be discovered. It is difficult to see how such a belief has anything to do with religion, except in so far as the whole natural order is regarded as existing in dependence upon the will of God. So we are in danger of approaching the problem of miracles along lines which have much more in common with what used to be called natural religion than with the New Testament. For if the New Testament is to be our guide, the only right context for miracles is theological. And by this I mean more than that in miracle a particular expression of the divine will, a particular manifestation of the divine power, is revealed. But miracle belongs to an order of things which has reality for us solely because God possesses that reality. That is not true of the order of history or of the order of nature. Whatever distinctions and reservations we make, each of these has some kind of reality for us, whether we do or do not hold that the word "God" is a word which affirms a reality. But when we think of faith and prayer, of providence and purpose in life, of hope and love in their deepest meaning, then we enter into a region which is mere phantasy apart from the reality of God. The truth of this region is not given in the natural order, and our knowledge of it is not derived from the knowledge which we can acquire from that order. We may gather arguments for its existence, as St. Paul teaches in the

first chapter of Romans, and we may appreciate the significance of the fact, on which Bishop Butler lays stress in the *Analogy*, that the natural order is on the side of moral goodness. But if that order reveals or suggests, it also largely hides. What we call revealed religion is not just natural religion prolonged. It is, at least in its dynamic aspect, the creation of a capacity for insight into the ways of God, whereby new assurances of Him and of His works are gained which nature itself is quite unable to supply. Moreover, while recognizing the truth of such an apologetic as that of Butler, which has been powerfully reaffirmed by Dr. Cairns in his recent volume, we must not overlook the darker side of the natural order, in which pessimistic thinkers find the vindication of their views. The fact that the Son of God has come is for St. John the great antithesis to the other fact that the whole world lieth in the evil one. And New Testament religion, as a whole, is much more the religion of supernatural contrast than of natural climax. For its world-view, sin, death and the devil are much too much at home in the world, much too powerful therein for there to be an easy, immediate movement from the world to God. Nothing throws more light on this than the New Testament doctrine of the Spirit. For the New Testament, the Spirit is not a spirit manifested in the world, even in the nobler aspects of the world's life ; but it is the Holy Spirit who has His dwelling and manifests His operations in the community which, existing in the world, is redeemed from the world. The language of the New Testament, when it speaks of the Holy Spirit, of the Church, of the new creation

and the new man and the new birth, of justification and redemption, is language which half expresses the sharp antithesis latent in the thought. It is language which, while it affirms, is also, implicitly, denying. And what it denies is that the relation of the spiritual to the natural order can be defined in any terms of progressive evolution.

And the background of it all is the Person of Christ as the New Testament writers present Him. His relation to the world-order is summed up in the fact that the crown He wears is not a crown of gold, but a crown of thorns. From that order He did not emerge as the fairest and most excellent of the children of men. He came, not to sanctify the old creation, but to create, by way of redemption, a new one. And in Him is given for faith the true context of what we call miracle. It is given in Him because, in relation to the natural order, He Himself, while He appears in it, is not of it. The word "miracle" must be used of Him before it is used of His works. And it is given for faith because faith is here the indispensable organ of apprehension of reality. It is not as though the fact of Christ were one thing, and what the fact is for faith another. But apart from faith there can be no true interpretation of the fact.

One of the remarkable things in the theology of Karl Barth which may yet create, and with much wholesome effect, the stir in England which it has aroused in Germany, is the emphasis he lays upon faith. There is with us not a little danger that the word "experience" may obscure the word "faith." We are inclined to lay too easy a stress upon experi-

ence as the way of rational apologetic. What Karl Barth sees is that there cannot be a fully rational apologetic. He expresses this in an unending series of bewildering and, doubtless, over-strained paradoxes. But what he makes clear is that when we affirm the reality of God we are not saying something which fits in neatly with all the other affirmations which are derived from our experiences of the order of this world. On the contrary, because, as he says, God is "never in man's reach, never in man's possession," therefore "he who says God, always says *miracle*" (*Wunder*). And "faith *is* miracle, or it is not faith."

Now, when Barth talks in this way he is not thinking of the miracles of the Gospels, of what we call the miraculous element in the life of Christ, but he is thinking of something which bears upon the whole miracle-problem. What is presented to us in Christ's Person in His revelation of God, in His atoning work, is something which transcends the levels of our earthly experience. And what we believe, which is our proper response to the presentation, can be stated in rational terms, but in terms which must always be inadequate because of the character of the realities to which they are applied.

It is to the redemptive side of God's activities, under the particular circumstances of the earthly life of the Redeemer, that the Gospel miracles belong. I think Dr. Cairns is right in his dissatisfaction with a theory of the miracles as simply so many testimonies to our Lord's Godhead. Yet the miracles are expressions of His Person; only they are such in a way which makes them something quite other than the acts characteristic of a Faith-healer, or than

the magic of a magician, were magic and magicians all that has in many centuries and parts of the world been supposed. While it is right to lay stress on the close association in the Gospels of the mighty works of Jesus, when they are works of healing, with the faith of the sufferer, the miracles are, at the same time, acts of authority which Jesus knows He has the power to perform. He who proclaimed the Kingdom of God as good tidings showed that the Kingdom was not only in word but in power, and that where it was present in the world (even if it is right to add by anticipation) in His Person, there it was manifested as a redemptive force rescuing man from the grip of physical as well as of moral evil. We have no formula, whether "higher law" or another, whereby we can describe and interpret this redemptive activity. What we see is the supremacy of spirit and will acting upon the physical order. Such supremacy is characteristic of Jesus in all the relations of His life. "Never man spake like this man"; and there is none other beside Him. In Him we have the great paradox of all history. Neither the ordinary nor the exceptional categories fit Him. The Gospels suggest that the key to this mystery is to be found only in His relation to God; that that was unique, and that in His whole life the results and meaning of that relation can be seen. But neither from history nor from science shall we derive any power to prove this.

So we reach this point—that we come to the miracles of Jesus through Jesus; and we come to Jesus through faith. There is no way of stating this which does not seem to have about it an element of the irrational.

Irrational, in the proper sense, it is not; but our reasoning powers are not capable of applying themselves, with the certainty that they are adequate to the subject-matter, to that which transcends human experience. The psychological explanation of the fantastic theory that Jesus never existed is the fact that at every point of the Gospels that transcendence is perceptible. So the paradox is made the mere fancy of a literature, not the reality of a life.

The crowning miracle of the Gospels is, according to the attitude which we adopt to it, determinative of our attitude towards the whole problem. It is noteworthy that it is one which allows us to speak of Christ as truly in the passive as in the active voice. Indeed, it is more significant, and apparently more in accordance with the earliest tradition, to say that God raised Christ from the dead than that Christ rose from the dead. The impressiveness of the evidence for the Resurrection, for the reality of the appearances as true manifestations of the risen Christ no hallucinations begotten of pious and pathetic wishes, and for the fact of the Empty Tomb, the Tomb in which the Body was laid, has been often and rightly emphasized. Yet here, too, we must remember that what we affirm is the resurrection of *Jesus*, and that the confidence of our affirmation is bound up with our faith in Jesus, and in what Jesus meant for God's redemptive purposes. I am not afraid of the statement that miracle is the dearest child of faith; the question is whether it is a true child. It was in reference to Himself that our Lord spoke of the presence of something more than Solomon

and Jonah. That "something more" was also "something new." In Him came the revelation, which was also the beginning, of the new world. The world, with Christ in it, is different from the world without Him. Yet there is no absolute separation. The old world was not abolished, but redeemed. We believe that the marks of that are written upon history ; the writing often seems faint, but it is there. Nor, though the signs are fewer, can we think of nature, the creation in St. Paul's use of the term, as excluded from the redemption that there is in Christ. But how was the new creation in its widest and richest sense established ? We have to reckon with the fact that over the life of Jesus hung the shadow of the Cross ; a shadow which at last enveloped it. And as a fact of the existing world-order the Cross was not a sign of redemption, but its exact reverse. Tragedy, failure, defeat : only such words could apply to it.

These, of course, were not the final words ; indeed, these words are not found. And in the New Testament, only for a comparatively few verses covering quite a small space of time are we in the atmosphere where such words would have been possible and natural. On the contrary, the New Testament attitude to the Cross is that it is the Tree of Salvation. And as to how that came about there is only one New Testament answer. The seeming defeat of the Cross was real victory, victory over sin, because in the Resurrection there was real victory, victory over death. Christ did not, somehow, survive death ; He triumphed over it, overwhelmed it. The opening of the Easter Collect strikes the

New Testament note : “ Almighty God, who through thine only-begotten Son Jesus Christ hast overcome death.” Christ, by His death, was the death of death. But he who says this in the New Testament sense says resurrection. And he who says resurrection says miracle. And (here I give the other side, the reverse, of Karl Barth’s obverse) he who says miracle says God.

It is only when our presuppositions are fully Christianized, only when we realize that with Christ there comes the new creation which is grounded in redemption, that we gain the standpoint and the understanding without which no true approach to the problem of miracles can be made. The context must be theological. Its central point must be the significance of Christ.

THE CHURCH AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY

BY THE REV. W. R. MATTHEWS, D.D., PROFESSOR OF
THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION, KING'S COLLEGE, LONDON

CHRISTIANITY has never been able for long to remain indifferent to the philosophies which were current in the world. It has always been impelled to relate itself with the systems of thought amid which it has been called to proclaim its gospel. We may see easily enough that those Christian leaders who from time to time have proclaimed the Church's independence of secular speculation are indulging in an idle dream, for the Christian religion is a view of the world and of life, and it is precisely that which every philosophy strives with more or less success to attain. But the main field of discussion shifts from time to time. In the early centuries of our religion and in the mediæval period, the chief effort of the Christian intellect was directed towards building up a system of truth in harmony with the best thought of the day—to exhibit the Christian scheme as the true philosophy over against all rival and imperfect theories. For a period the sphere of the decisive conflict seemed to change, and in the nineteenth century the Church was concerned chiefly with the challenge to its historical foundations by the

new criticism. The issues of that controversy are not yet completely settled, but once more the conflict tends to concentrate in the field of philosophy. Deeper than any merely historical question is the problem whether the world as known to the modern mind is compatible with belief in God and in Christ as the supreme Revelation of God. Once more we are forced back upon first principles and realize that our most urgent need is for the discovery of some coherent intellectual basis on which to found our system of religious truth.

This need for some intelligible philosophy of Christianity is felt beyond the circle of those who may be described as "intellectuals." Perhaps half-unconsciously many have the impression that the Church is living mentally a "hand-to-mouth" existence. Though they might put their complaint in other words, they fail to find in us a consistent view of the nature of Reality. We hear that in some quarters the Roman Church makes converts. We are often told that it appeals to the emotional and the weak who need a self-confident authority, and doubtless there is truth in this; but to others it has quite a different appeal. It is the one Church in Christendom which can claim to have a coherent intellectual foundation. The remarkable Neo-Scholastic movement has renovated the system of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Roman Church can confront the world with a philosophy which has Christianized Aristotle. I do not believe that the renovation has gone far enough, nor that the metaphysics of Aristotle can be made an adequate medium for the articulation either of the Christian values or of the results of

modern science ; but though the philosophy of the Roman Church may be antiquated and inadequate, at least it has one, and it reaps the reward of having something intelligible to say to the man who seeks for reason in religion.

Recent years have seen a revival of interest in the problems of philosophy, and at the same time a growth of distrust in those complete systems which formerly held the field. The philosophers and men of science in the nineteenth century moved in different spheres, the former often attempting to lay down laws which the latter received with complete indifference. The salient feature of the present situation is that a new approach to philosophy is being made from the standpoint of natural science. The old assumption that science could quietly pursue its researches, disregarding the questions which philosophy discussed, is being given up. The " Positivist " position which banned metaphysics as a needless delusion, the ghost of theology, is fast crumbling away. For the progress of science, and particularly of physics, has itself raised some of the central problems of philosophy. Relativity with its implications has brought the physicist to the question of the nature and the reality of space and time. Not far behind lies the prior question of the nature and validity of scientific truth, a problem which has recently engaged the attention of more than one man of science.

If, however, we may observe in the older sciences a reawakening of interest in the problems of philosophy, an opposite tendency is manifest in the youngest science of all. Psychology was long regarded merely as a department of metaphysics, and the human

mind was studied in the light of *a priori* rational principles. Psychology has now vindicated for itself a place among the natural sciences. Too long perhaps it was enslaved to the metaphysician, and just now it is proclaiming its independence by claiming to supplant the philosophers altogether. Positivism and empiricism, which are in retreat in the sphere of physics, are in the ascendant in the psychological arena, and we are confronted with the confident assertion that the problems of philosophy and theology, including the nature and validity of the religious experience itself, can be elucidated by the researches of experimental psychologists. An extreme instance of this trend towards materialism in psychology is the "Behaviourist" school, which would ignore consciousness altogether and explain human behaviour in physiological terms, and ultimately, I suppose, in terms of physics. It is a curious phenomenon that while the science of matter and motion seems to be impelled by its own development to reintegrate them with Mind, the science of mind is engaged in reducing its subject-matter to cases of matter in motion. We may be sure that this is but a passing phase in the progress of an infant science. The real pioneers in psychology, men like James Ward and Dr. Jung, to mention two of very different schools, have illustrated the truth that, to parody Bacon, depth in psychology leads us back to philosophy. And on general grounds we may predict that the importance of philosophy in the modern world will steadily increase. The questions which it asks, the nature, the validity, the limits of knowledge, are questions which, in the long run, cannot be burked;

the impulse which is behind it, that of becoming a "synoptic" man, of gaining some conception of the nature and meaning of Reality as a whole, cannot be suppressed.

When we turn our attention to the work in constructive philosophy which is now being done a scene of some confusion meets our eyes. In philosophy, as in most other things, we have the misfortune to belong to a period of transition. It is in vain that we seek for a system, or even a point of view, which could justly be acclaimed as "the modern philosophy." And herein lies perhaps the chief difficulty of the philosophical theologian. Enlisted in the task of interpreting the Christian Faith in terms of modern thought, he can assume no generally accepted philosophy as his starting-point; he is compelled to choose between rival theories, or to make his own philosophy. This could hardly have been said twenty years ago. Then the Idealistic philosophies, all owing something to Hegel, were in the ascendant, at least in England. Much valuable work was done in the attempt to state the Christian Faith within the framework of Idealism. Most of it will have to be done all over again, for a salient feature of the present situation is the Realist reaction against the great idealists of the previous generation. Now that Lord Haldane has gone, the school of Bradley and Bosanquet is almost without important representatives. As I have said, the scientific approach to the philosophical problem is to-day the most frequented, and herein I would single out the new views which have appeared on the nature of evolution.

The evolutionary view of the world is probably the

most characteristic feature of the modern standpoint. In this respect we differ profoundly from previous ages, and it is natural therefore that a considerable part of the constructive thought of our time should centre upon the interpretation of evolution. Time would fail me to give even a summary account of the divergent philosophies of evolution which are before the world. The work of Bergson is well known, but the equally important contributions of two English thinkers, Alexander and Lloyd Morgan, are not even yet sufficiently appreciated in their own country. In general, we may discover a common tendency in the philosophies of evolution. As a philosophical concept evolution is not a mechanical and purely irrational process. In various forms these thinkers discern some immanent trend in evolution which is at least akin to purpose. For Bergson the Life Force is the progressive achievement of freedom ; in the thought of Alexander and Lloyd Morgan the evolutionary process includes the " emergence " of new and higher types of existence which are not completely explicable by what went before. To Alexander the world-process appears as an endless approximation towards Deity, while to Lloyd Morgan it is the manifestation of a Deity who timelessly exists. Reflection upon the implications of evolution has not reached its end ; but at least we may see in the philosophies for which it is the central fact a welcome change from the dead materialism of the previous generation and a return to a position from which it will once more be possible to present an argument from the evidence of design, though on a wider scale than ever before.

Modern philosophy is for the most part frankly

based upon experience. It distrusts the abstract *a priori* road and alleged "self-evident" ideas. In the past the appeal to experience has too often meant an appeal only to one aspect of experience, and its outcome has been a stunted philosophy of Naturalism. To-day in many quarters the full consequences of the appeal to experience are accepted and the right of moral, æsthetic and religious experience is being recognized. The evolution of the thought of Dr. A. N. Whitehead is specially noteworthy as a sign of the times. Beginning with a severely scientific and mathematical essay towards a philosophy of nature, he has been led to recognize that there are other modes of apprehending Reality than the scientific, and in view of the apprehension of values, by poet and prophet, he has affirmed the existence of a "Præter Nature" from which alone the meaning and value of the world is derived. This brings us to the last point on which it is possible to dwell here—the place of personality in modern thought. Obviously, the interest of modern philosophy in evolution and in values combine to concentrate attention upon personality, for it is in human personality that we discover the highest point of evolution and the meeting-place of all values. The problem of personality and of its place in Reality lies at the centre of the reflection of to-day.

A survey of the tendencies of philosophy at the present time is by no means depressing from a Christian point of view. The older dogmatic materialism or naturalism is visibly disappearing; its chief presuppositions are being undermined, and we find even Mr. Bertrand Russell throwing over the principle

of the uniformity of nature as one which is incapable of proof and probably untrue. New vistas are opening before us in the changed conceptions among philosophers of the nature of evolution ; the philosophy of experience warrants us in hoping that the significance of religious experience will be more carefully pondered as a clue to the meaning of the world. The concentration upon the problems of personality is in accord with our religion, which proclaims the value of all persons and finds its highest knowledge of God through one Person.

The Christian theologian should be more than a mere spectator of the current of secular thought, standing, as it were, upon the bank waiting for something favourable to come along. In my opinion we need a distinctively Christian philosophy. In the past Christian thought has moved within the framework of many different systems ; Platonism, Aristotelianism, Cartesianism, Spinozism, Hegelianism, have all been more or less successfully reconciled with the Gospel and have served as foundations for Christian theologies. None has proved entirely adequate to express the Christian life-values, and none has remained intact as a possible philosophy for the present age. The hope awakens that now perhaps may arise a philosophy from within Christianity itself, a Christian philosophy, which, flowing from the central experience of God in Christ, may present the outlines of a complete world-view, able to include all aspects of the Universe revealed in perception and cognition. The omens are not unfavourable. As we have seen, the supplanting of static by dynamic categories, the prominence of the problems of value

and of personality, all create an atmosphere of thought in which the genius of Christianity may feel free to express itself. We may count many prominent labourers in this field of Christian propaganda. We need more co-operation in this essential task. If I may be allowed to conclude with a practical suggestion, it is that we shall miss our opportunity unless we are prepared to reform our theological education. The philosophy of religion is no "extra" which can be omitted without loss from the equipment of those who are to be teachers of religion. On the contrary, it is the centre of the intellectual conflict of our time. Its problems are the fundamental problems of religion; upon their solution depend in the long run the fortunes of the Church in the future.

MODERN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE CHRISTIAN CONCEPTION OF PERSONALITY

BY THE REV. L. W. GRENSTED, B.D., FELLOW OF
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, OXFORD

IS there such a thing as a Christian conception of Personality? In one sense clearly there is not. Christianity has never claimed to have any special philosophy. It offers no definitions, whether of God or of man, but expresses itself by analogy and Sacrament. It asks us to have the mind of Christ, to see God and man as He sees them. But no philosophy is excommunicated, save by its own results.

Similarly, Christianity has no special psychology. There is no authoritative analysis of human nature. The fragments of Semitic psychology which appear in the Old Testament, and again in St. Paul's Epistles, are casual and accidental. And, interesting as they may be to the student of the history of religious thought, they claim no finality. It is not in the least necessary for the Christian to understand the ancient Hebrew conception of a body framed of the dust of the ground and animated by a life which is identified with either the breath or the blood, which leaves the body at death, dispersed into the air or the soil, and so returns "to God Who gave it." Nor,

again, need we discuss what was meant precisely by making the heart and other bodily organs the seat of the emotions. Nor, turning to the New Testament, need we decide what is in St. Paul's mind when he speaks of the flesh, the soul or life, and the spirit a psychological trichotomy of the greatest interest and with very close parallels in some modern systems. What is fundamental and significant is the use which he makes of this analysis to express the great facts of evil as a power in human life, and of the spiritual transformation whereby the power of evil is met by an even greater power, when the Spirit which was in Christ Jesus is in us also, and we are set free from the law of sin and death.

But though Christianity has no special philosophy or psychology, it takes up certain definite positions which are linked so intimately with the Gospel of Jesus Christ that we cannot well deny them and remain Christian. In effect these positions are three.

In the first place, there is *the Worth of man* in the sight of God. The whole Bible, Old Testament and New, is witness to this worth. Man, created in God's Image, is the crown and goal of God's handiwork. History is God's untiring effort to bring man to that triumphant destiny which is his true end. He chose for Himself a people that He might dwell among them, and when they turned aside He sent to them by His messengers, rising up early and sending. Even His wrath, present and apocalyptic, is witness to the high worth of man in His esteem. Such passion in God was indeed a stumbling-block to the best mind of the nations. The ancient philosophies of East and West had lifted their thought of God far beyond all

care for transient things to an exaltation, whether of contemplation or of indifference, which left man baffled and belittled. But the Christians even dared to say that their God had died for them, and by a shameful and unworthy death. The pagan mythologies, even when they spoke of suffering Gods and saviour Gods, could show no parallel to this. And no greater claim for the worth of man has or could ever have been made.

In other language, Christianity is committed irrevocably to a philosophy of ultimate values, and it applies this philosophy simply and directly, and not in any Platonic and abstract doctrine of the Good, the Beautiful, and the True. Platonism, indeed, has been the ally of Christianity; but it has often been a dangerous ally, threatening with metaphysical abstraction alike its concrete God (to borrow a term from von Hügel) and the concrete objects of His purpose. Further, this purpose expresses itself as love, and love is for the Christian the supreme, and indeed the only, expression of personality. "Owe no man anything, save to love one another." But love is the final recognition of the worth of man as a value overriding all other values.

In the second place, Christianity holds firmly to a belief in *Moral Responsibility*. Neither in the Bible, nor, for the matter of that, in the theologians, is there any solution of the problem of freedom and determinism. But the great fact of sin, with all that it implies, is faced unflinchingly. Compared with this direct facing of the fact, the occasional theories and comments as to its origin are quite secondary. There are the Serpent-Tempter, the fallen angels of the

“ Watchers ” story, the ominously cynical Satan, and even the “ evil spirit from the Lord ” which troubled Saul. Our Lord Himself by no means underrates these spiritual forces of evil. The devil had power to visit even Him with temptation. He knew of evil powers that went not out save by prayer and fasting. But the problem for man is not a problem of devils, but of his own soul. The call to the Kingdom is a call to repentance. When the victory is won within, the victory without is won as well. Man as man is responsible, and, at least in that sense, he is free.

Christianity has gone on to see in the triumph of the Cross a triumph that is something more than the solution of the direct and individual problem of man's sin. Whatever the outside factors may be, unseen principalities and powers, spiritual wickedness in high places, these too are met and their strength broken. But the doctrine of the Atonement does not concern us here. The central fact for the Christian view of personality is that man has, and holds even in his sinning, the dignity of moral responsibility. To make excuse for sin is to deny our birthright, our one honour which stands in the sight of God.

Thirdly, and very distinctively, Christianity stands for the principle that *man is capable of being possessed by the Spirit of God*. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not clearly formulated until towards the end of the fourth century, but it was implicit in Christian experience from the first. And herein Christianity brings to its full and true expression a principle which is of fundamental importance. Personality is not a phenomenon of monads, of isolated individuals living their own lives in the merest superficial contact with

other individuals and with the world. The ever-present fact of common daily intercourse only fails to amaze us because it is so obvious that its full meaning escapes our notice. We live not to ourselves but to others. And behind the experience of intercourse with our fellows, through which love expresses itself, there is the further experience of power which lives through and in us. Men have at different times felt and expressed this sense of possession in very diverse ways. The emotional extravagances of witch-doctor, dervish and fakir, the ecstasy of the prophets (and herein the prophets of Baal and the prophets of the Lord may not be too exactly distinguished), the self-abandonment of the mystic, the divine *Wanderlust* of a St. Paul or a Livingstone, all alike bear testimony to a type of experience of which the Christian alone possesses the full secret. Personality does not come to completeness solely by some inherent initiative, some mysterious innate force which drives it on towards perfection. The achievement of human life cannot be explained from within, save in the sense that it is deep within the very inmost shrine of man's spirit that the Spirit of God dwells. The power that is upon us is a power greater than ourselves. It is Very God in us, working, if we will, His own good pleasure.

Again we may put this in other language. Christianity teaches the creative possibilities of personality. Not only is there freedom in the sense of moral choice, but there is freedom in the still higher sense of spiritual adventure. We are not bound by the past, or limited solely to the resources which we have ourselves accumulated. These things condition our

lives, but do not thereby restrict them, unless we will have it so. The Christian doctrine of forgiveness is a doctrine of ever-new beginning. "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee," leads naturally enough to "Arise, and take up thy bed, and walk."

These things are obvious enough, and it would hardly be worth while to call attention to them if it were not for the widespread interest in the problems of personality which modern psychology has evoked. The great development of analytical and experimental methods has led to the accumulation of enormous masses of material for the study of human mental processes and behaviour. It is supposed by some psychologists that this material enables them to solve the problem of the nature of personality. More commonly, perhaps, the work of the psychologist rests upon assumptions as to the nature of personality which are not clearly thought out. It is all the more necessary for those who wish to avail themselves of the immense help which modern psychology can give to understand the true bearing of its methods. Whether it is to be our ally, or, as some would hold, our enemy, let us at least know what is its real strength.

There are many clergy to-day studying and trying to apply the so-called New Psychology. Not for one instant should we despise any weapon that may reinforce our spiritual armoury. There can be no doubt that theological students should have some practical psychological knowledge. Yet we would ask them to remember that psychology is not as yet one single system, whether of theory or of practice, proved, tested, and found good. Methods of mental

analysis and of suggestion are devices with a definite scope, and with equally definite limitations and dangers. They will not in themselves supply a scale of spiritual values. Responsibility still rests upon us for the choice of the highest ends. Psychology knows nothing of higher and lower. It may help us to secure efficiency, whether in the individual life or in the development of the organization of a Church, but it will not tell us to what ultimate end we are to be efficient. And sometimes its failure to appreciate the end may render its advice as to means more than precarious. Least of all can psychology as a science take into its scope the creative possibilities of the Spirit of God. Invaluable as an aid to our work, it can never for us take the first place. The primary weapons of our warfare are simpler, and more direct, and it may be that we shall serve our office best when we keep most closely to spiritual things. As psychologists we can at the best be but amateurs. As priests we know in Whom we have believed, and we may not forget our calling. Perchance in the end we shall find that if we have tried in the very simplest way to bring people to God in Christ our psychology has not been very far amiss after all.

Let us turn to the psychological conception of personality, that we may see exactly where the issue lies. A search for definitions in the psychological literature will very soon convince us that there is no such conception available. What the psychologists offer us, in bewildering variety, are methods of studying personality, of curing personality when it is diseased, of educating personality. These methods in each case involve some analysis of personality,

and it is hardly unfair to say that the psychological treatment of the subject has the greatest appearance of success just where the analysis is least complete. It is always easier to frame a science where the subject-matter is carefully restricted. But for any complete conception of personality we shall seek far indeed.

We shall assume that in the case of man we mean the whole man, body, soul, and spirit, whatever exactly those terms may imply, throughout his whole life, including all the possibilities which eternity contains for him. Let us start from an analogy. Clearly, we can obtain an exact but very partial account of man by the science of anatomy, which at some given moment takes his dead body and sorts out its structure in detail. Equally clearly, the surgeon's work would be very simple if he had nothing more than anatomy to consider. The fact that his patient is living, and that his purpose is conditioned by the patient's subsequent comfort and efficiency, alters the whole surgical outlook. And so even in this elementary case questions of purpose and of the choice of ends arise, and complicate the scientific outlook. And the choice of ends is not in the hands of the surgeon. In many cases the patient may have to decide whether he wishes an injured limb to be made serviceable to this or that use. He may choose to have a hand that looks like a hand, but is useless, or a screw fitting which will enable him to use tools suited to some given trade. Surgical science will enable him to fulfil his purpose, but it cannot make the choice for him.

This example from anatomy is perhaps the simplest possible. The issue which it raises is vital for the

psychologist of to-day. Is he to restrict his conception of man to something which can be managed scientifically? Is he, for example, to take into account anything more than observed human behaviour? A large and energetic school of psychologists has arisen in America which has carried this aspect of psychology to its logical conclusion, and which fittingly styles its theory Behaviourism. For these writers psychology deals simply with that which can be observed in a purely external manner. A man's personality is simply the sum total of his observable activities. Consciousness, and that inner aspect of life which consciousness reveals to us, are simply ruled out of court. So far as the Behaviourist is concerned, it might not even exist. And the literature of Behaviourism is an enormous labyrinth of observed reactions to stimulus, dealing with human life in the utmost detail by the way of the *questionnaire* and the laboratory experiment, and, to all appearance, utterly oblivious to every ultimate value of life.

There are two observations which we must make at this point. In the first place, Behaviourism is a perfectly legitimate science. It is on an exactly parallel footing with anatomy and physiology, and, indeed, is little more than an elaborate extension of the latter. When it has discovered its true rôle, it will be of immense value to the student of human life.

In the second place, Behaviourism does explicitly what much modern psychology has done implicitly. Its view of life is frankly materialist and external. The only ultimate reality which it knows is the law of cause and effect. But much of the modern psychological success has been achieved by applying

just this same method to mental processes in general. In psycho-analysis proper, for example, we have the elaborate study of mental imagery and of the related emotional systems worked out without any reference to ends, other than the barest biological ends of the appetites and their satisfaction. To the Behaviourist all the Freudian system is mere speculative mythology, since it rests after all upon matter which cannot be externally observed. The patient must report to the observer upon the contents of his mind. And this involves introspection, which to the Behaviourist is anathema. But the Freudian introspection is limited in its scope by just the same principles as those which dominate Behaviourism. It views mind and mental process externally, and fails to recognize the fundamental things. We cannot pursue the matter further, but the point is of crucial importance, and it is raised by any psychological system which rests upon an empirical basis. If we are to use psychology in the service of religion we must submit it to the closest scrutiny, and must see that this restricted and external aspect of it is not dominating our theory and practice. So prayer might indeed be reduced to auto-suggestions and contrition be resolved in dispassionate (and unprofitable) self-analysis.

The challenge put forth by Behaviourism, and less explicitly but equally gravely by Freudianism, and some other systems, is one which we cannot refuse to take up, whether as psychologists or as Christians. For psychology it means that we must accept without reserve, in spite of all difficulties, the method of introspection as well as that of external observation. We can only interpret that which we observe in

others by trying in all sincerity and honesty to read ourselves. It is the ancient way of the philosophers, and where psychology has left that ancient way she has become a science, it is true, but at the cost of surrendering all claim to have even an opinion upon the ultimate things. But where the method of true introspection is rightly used psychology becomes rich indeed, and its full riches have not been seen as yet. Hints of this wealth come to us on all sides. Jung, in his use of analysis, has found the mind of man not bound by a dead past, but living and creative. Adler has seen man's impulse to power expressing itself in a guiding principle by which his life shapes itself. Rivers has taught us to see in the developing achievements of our mental life a parallel to the biological achievements of the body, a progress in which the lower is at once suppressed and subsumed in the service of the higher. McDougall points to a trend or purpose running through the whole of our instinctive life. Shand shows us how our life develops into a unity as it is directed towards objects outside itself. And Freud himself uses a Christian phrase sometimes in an almost Christian meaning when he tells us that the essential life is the "love-life."

May we not look further still and ask that psychology shall take yet fuller account of that which the study of man's soul reveals? Freedom, and moral responsibility, and the power of the Spirit that is upon us, and the supreme worth of personality, are not things in doubt to be explained away. They are the essential and ultimate terms of which the final psychology is to be built up, and by which the

abundant detail of the present partial views of human personality is to be checked. We have much to learn of the psychologists, and yet we hope that they will not count it arrogance in us if we claim that as Christians we hold already a truth which sometimes eludes their grasp, and without which their systems can only be systems of a day.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER
COMMUNIONS AND REUNION IN THE
MISSION FIELD

RELATIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNIONS

BY THE MOST REV. ARCHBISHOP GERMANOS,
METROPOLITAN OF THYATEIRA

I FEEL I must address a few words of thanks to His Lordship the Bishop of Gloucester for affording me the opportunity of putting before you the position of the relations between the Orthodox and the Anglican Communion from the Orthodox point of view.

This report, while it will, I am sure, fill your hearts with hopes for the future of these relations, will, on the other hand, show how long the road still is which will have to be travelled before these relations can terminate in the desired end—that is to say, the reunion of these two Communion. What was needed in order successfully to cultivate these relations was that they should be put on a sound basis, as a starting-point from which to proceed slowly but surely to the end in view. And the honour of finding this basis is due, as all are agreed, to the venerable Primate of the Anglican Church, Dr. Randall Davidson, who, from his deep love for the much tried Churches of Eastern Christendom, has found this starting-point in a mutual *rapprochement* between these two Churches. This initiative, which received

a grateful recognition by the Orthodox Church, rekindled in her also the desire for reunion, and has been instrumental in denoting the right spirit in which the existing differences between the two Churches must be discussed. May I be allowed therefore, as representing the Orthodox Church in this country, to express at the beginning a respectful greeting to His Grace for all his labours in the work of *rapprochement* and mutual understanding between both our Churches.

I

THE TWO CHURCHES IN THE REMOTE PAST

What interests us principally is the aspect which the relations between the two Churches have assumed during the last years. Nevertheless, it must not be supposed that the relations between the two Churches began only yesterday. His Grace the Archbishop of Wales, in his address some time ago to the two Patriarchs of the East, Alexandria and Jerusalem, reminded them of the relations already existing between the Church of Wales and the Eastern Churches. He also emphasized the point that from the East came the first missionaries, who founded the Church in Wales, and in support of this mentioned the fact that even after the establishment of the Archbishopric of Canterbury by Saint Augustine (who came from Rome in A.D. 596) the Church in Wales continued to be independent, and that many years passed before the complete assimilation between the two parts of the Anglican Church took place. And what is true of the Church of Wales is true also of the Church of Ireland, in which the first to preach

the Gospel were Greeks from Asia Minor. Although it cannot be proved whether these missionaries came from Lyons, where the two disciples of Polycarp of Smyrna, Pothinos and Irenæus, worked, or from Marseilles, which had close commercial ties with Britain.

Moreover, however much the Greek Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodore of Tarsus (A.D. 669), owed his missionary work in this country to the initiative of the Pope of Rome, he never ceased to belong, both by descent and culture, to the East. It is, therefore, only right that we should accept the fact that while organizing the Church of England, he followed both the principles and traditions which he had learnt in the East. "The Church of England," says the historian Green, "as we know it to-day is the work of a Greek monk"; and Trevelyan says, "The Archbishop Theodore stands out as perhaps the greatest Prince of the Church in all English history."

We must pass on a long way in the centuries in order to find a new *rapprochement* between the two Churches—to the time when the Church of England, after emancipation from Rome, appears as an Independent Church. It is at the time of Cyril Lucaris, Patriarch of Alexandria (1602–21) and later of Constantinople. Without entering here into a detailed examination of the convictions of this Patriarch, we can say the following. Although the assertion of Dositheos, Patriarch of Jerusalem, is true, that the Orthodox Church did not recognize Cyril as a heretic Patriarch, it is apparent from surviving letters of his (Cyril's) to different personalities in the West and to the Archbishop of Canterbury, Abbot,

that such was the case. Moreover, it is well known that Metrophames Critopoulos, who for five years studied at Oxford as a ward of Abbot and succeeded Cyril on the throne of Alexandria, did not hesitate to sign his condemnation at the Synod of Constantinople, in 1638. The Calvinistic Confession by Cyril Lucaris which appeared in the West, and which provoked great trouble in the Church of the East during the seventeenth century, not only did not contribute to the tightening of the bonds of friendship between the two Churches, as was foreshadowed in the correspondence between Cyril and Abbot, but had a contrary effect on the Orthodox Church by arousing doubts and suspicions. And when Dr. Woodroffe, an ardent advocate of the unity of Christendom, addressed himself to the Patriarch of Constantinople, Callinicus II, asking him to send students to the Greek College at Oxford, of which he was the Principal, the Patriarch disregarded his request. The widespread idea that the Orthodox Church had become Calvinistic made the Patriarchs very reserved in their relations with the Anglicans, especially where there was a question of the education of Orthodox young men at English Universities.

Despite all this, the Eastern Patriarchs did not disregard the overtures made to them by the Non-Jurors regarding reunion. These negotiations cannot be said to have been conducted between the two Churches, since the Non-Jurors were in schism with the Church of England, and as soon as this became known, from a letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Wake, to the Patriarch of Jerusalem, Chrysanthos (1725), they were broken off. But the correspondence, and

especially the answers given by the Patriarchs of the East to the questions put by the Non-Jurors, are of extreme interest, as having been given on the supposition that these represented the whole Church of England. Thus, the Patriarchs not only did not question the impossibility of the creation of an Independent Anglican Church, but, on the contrary, supported this idea. They agreed that the Anglicans should retain their own customs, and declared themselves ready to approve of the Anglican Liturgy, provided it was Orthodox. Likewise, they accepted the explanation given, that the Procession of the Holy Ghost from the Son does not mean that the Son is the active cause of the existence of the Holy Ghost, but is only of the sending forth of the Holy Ghost through the Son to the world, and praised their decision to communicate the Elements in both kinds, and their acceptance of the other Sacraments. The Orthodox Patriarchs, however, refuted the opinion that the decisions of the seven Œcumenical Councils have not the same authority as Scripture, and insisted upon the Non-Jurors giving honour to the Virgin and the Saints, paying reverence to their Eikons and believing in their intercession. But the Patriarchs were adamant on the question of Transubstantiation, because the struggle in the East against Calvinistic teaching of the Holy Eucharist was very recent. Therefore they added the Synodical decision of 1691, under the Patriarch Dionysios, and the Synodical reply which was sent through the Chaplain of the British Legation, J. Covel (1672), to the Philhellenes of Great Britain who asked what was the teaching of the Eastern Church on the Sacraments, and

especially on the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. In their second answer to the Non-Jurors, the Patriarchs, through the Holy Synod of Russia, sent the Confession of Dositheos to them as a basis on which reunion might be accomplished.

A century and a half later we find a fresh contact between the heads of the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. Gregory VI, Patriarch of Constantinople, on the request of the Archbishop of Canterbury, Archibald Campbell, in a Synodical Encyclical which he sent to all the Metropolitans in 1869, ordered that all Anglicans who die in places where there do not exist Anglican cemeteries should be buried in the Orthodox cemeteries, and by Orthodox priests, and he likewise ordered a special service to be drawn up to be used on such occasions. However insignificant this concession seems today, it is, nevertheless, the first step towards the *rapprochement* of the Churches in a purely Ecclesiastical matter. The visit of the Archbishop of Syros and Tenos, Alexander Lycourgos, to England in 1870 gave rise not only to immediate intercourse between himself and Anglican Bishops, but also to theological conversations, which enlightened him regarding the existing points of agreement and disagreement between the two Churches. Of greater importance from a dogmatic point of view was the meeting between Anglicans and Orthodox at the reunion Congresses held at Bonn in 1874-5, on the initiative of the Old Catholics. Although at these Congresses complete agreement was not reached on the debated points, the important points must not

be overlooked on which agreement was reached. The outstanding point of the famous "Filioque" Clause, about which much has been written in the past, after close historical examination at these Congresses, was so elucidated as to make the agreement reached there the starting-point of agreement in later discussions. As a basis of this agreement, there was laid down the teaching of the Fathers of the Undivided Church, especially that of St. John Damascene, in which the Holy Ghost proceeded from the Father through the Son. Important also is the common acceptance at these Congresses of the ancient Creeds and the Dogmatic decisions of the Undivided Church, as by this acceptance a firm basis was made for future discussions on the questions separating the Churches one from the other.

The visit of the late Right Reverend Bishop of Salisbury, John Wordsworth, and especially his meeting with the Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantine V (1897-1900), still further strengthened the bonds between the two Churches. A Committee appointed by the Œcumenical Patriarchate, consisting of the Great Vicar and the Keeper of the Archives, undertook to collaborate with the English Archdeacon Dowling in order to enlighten the Orthodox on the teaching of the Anglican Church. The result of this collaboration is to be found in the answers which were given by the Bishop of Salisbury to questions put by the Orthodox members of the Committee, referring to the points under discussion.

II

THE TWO CHURCHES AT THE BEGINNING OF THE
TWENTIETH CENTURY

A fresh and more interesting development is presented in the relations between the two Churches, especially from the beginning of the twentieth century, and during and after the Great War. While hitherto the relations between the two Churches were confined to a more formal manner, and the discussions bore a purely academic character, the Great War brought a great change both in the relations and the discussions. The reasons which brought about these changes are the following: The sympathy shown by the venerable Anglican Church towards the much-tried Christians of the East by raising her voice for justice and liberation of the enslaved Christian people moved the leaders of the Orthodox Church profoundly and filled with gratitude the hearts of the Orthodox nations. This reason, however unrelated it may appear to be to the question of the reunion of the Churches, was the psychological reason for a closer contact, better knowledge and friendly understanding between the Churches, which constituted the sound reason for the change. Distinguished members of the Orthodox Church belonging to the different Autocephalous Churches of the East visited England and America, where they studied and obtained a deep knowledge of the life of the Anglican Communion, entered into discussions with its members, eliminated misunderstanding and dispelled doubts. The presence of the then Metropolitan of Athens and present Patriarch of Alexandria, Meletius, accom-

panied by distinguished Orthodox theologians such as the present Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostom, and Professor Alivisatos, and the serious discussions with Anglican theologians, first in America and then in England, as well as the agreement arrived at on many of these points, revived the hopes of reunion between the Churches. Orthodox theologians also from Serbia and Rumania, who visited England and got to know the Anglican Church, returned home carrying with them the idea that the gulf separating the two Churches must not be considered impassable.

The Encyclical published by the Œcumenical Patriarchate in 1920, by which all the Churches of Christ were summoned to form a League of Churches and collaborate on moral and social questions in which all the Churches were interested, cannot be, of course, considered as an attempt at reunion in the strict meaning of the word. No one will, however, deny that reunion was the object which was really intended by the lines of the Encyclical. The Patriarch, in acknowledging that the existing differences and prejudices could not at once be removed, proposed the brotherhood and co-operation of the Churches as being the safest means which "will prepare and facilitate the complete and blessed Union which may some day be obtained with God's help."

But what has really contributed to the strengthening of the relations between the two Churches is undoubtedly the invitation given by His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Randall Davidson, to the Œcumenical Patriarchate to send a delegation of Orthodox theologians and clergy in order to discuss

with the Committee appointed by the Lambeth Conference the dogmatic questions which separate the two Churches. It appears from the report submitted that the discussion was not confined only to Baptism, Chrism (Confirmation), the Holy Eucharist, the seventh Œcumenical Council, the validity of Anglican Orders, and certain questions of Canon Law on marriage, with which the Committee from Athens and the Serbian and Rumanian theologians had been occupied, but that it was widened to include other matters. Thus, the teaching on tradition, the Creeds, and especially the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed, with the "Filioque" Clause, the symbolical books of the Anglican Church, that is to say, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Prayer Book, the Sacraments of Marriage, Penance and Unction, the state of the departed in Christ and their connection with the Church Militant, were also subjects of discussion. And the enumeration only of the subjects shows that the importance of the discussion was such as to justify us in insisting further on this discussion.

In this debate the delegation recognized the validity of Baptism as performed by Anglican priests, also of Confirmation as performed by the Bishops by the laying on of hands; but they insisted that Chrism should immediately follow Baptism, while the catechizing of the newly-baptized should be postponed until they were older. It is of special interest that the Patriarchal delegation insisted upon the Anglicans recognizing the Holy Eucharist as being of a sacrificial character, and the introduction of the Epiclesis of the Holy Spirit as necessary for the

change of the Holy Elements ; also that the wafer bread should be changed for leavened bread, specially prepared, and that the wine should be mixed with water. Despite these, the term Transubstantiation was happily eliminated, as the delegation confined itself to the terms, Change (*μεταδοχή*) and Transformation (*μεταποίησις*), by which the true meaning of the term is given and misunderstandings are avoided. About the validity of Anglican orders, which constituted an important matter of discussion both in itself and in relation to the valid performance of the other Sacraments, the delegation reserved its own personal opinion, and left it to the study and decision of the official body of the Church. While the delegation remained satisfied because the Anglicans accepted the decision relating to Eikons of the seventh Œcumenical Council, and recognized the Nicene Creed as really œcumenical, it is aware of the opposition manifested by the Anglicans for the elimination of the anti-canonically added " Filioque " Clause.

The delegation took into consideration the declaration by the Anglicans that the Thirty-nine Articles are not articles of Faith, but are articles of confession connected with the established character of the Church, and expressed the opinion that, as their abolition is impossible if the Church is not to be separated from the State, only an amendment of these articles by the competent authorities would be possible. When the Anglicans declared that the Prayer Book contained the true teaching of the Anglican Church, on the basis of the principle of *Lex orandi, Lex credendi*, the delegation accepted this as being a more favourable

starting-point of understanding, inasmuch as it was said that the imminent revision of the Prayer Book would show a more Catholic emphasis. On both sides a marriage performed in cases of necessity by a priest of either Communion is recognized; the Orthodox gave explanations as to auricular confession in the Orthodox Church, and the object of the Sacrament of Unction. The delegation mentions the impression created by the declaration made by the Anglicans, that prayers for the dead are in use now in the Anglican Church, and that their use is becoming more general by permission of the Bishops. But in exposing the above, the delegation does not pass it over without some criticism. Thus, in seeking the reason for which the Anglican insists upon having inter-communion in cases of necessity as being a preparatory step towards a fuller inter-communion, despite the existing differences in faith, it finds this reason in the following: The Anglicans have a wider conception of the Church which is to the Orthodox incomprehensible. And the delegation adds: that the hopes it has derived from the conversation with the competent Committee have been greatly reduced by the Appeal issued by the Lambeth Conference to all Christian people. According to the delegation, the terms offered by this Appeal for a re-united Church are terms which suit their own conditions more than ours. "Their own religious and ecclesiastical conditions lead them to propose to the Non-Episcopal Churches terms which are in opposition to our principles and system." Therefore the delegation says that after their sojourn in England they are persuaded that the "*Communio in Sacris*," with-

out a previous agreement on dogma, is not the road which leads to the safe and saving reunion of our churches. Nevertheless, the delegation, in praise of the zeal of the "Anglicans, considers it a duty of the Orthodox to continue" contributing in every way to the success of such a work, agreeable to God, as the Union of the Churches, convinced that the all-powerful hand of God will, in time, take away all difficulties and will bring about a work which will be a blessing for Christendom and of the greatest advantage to mankind.

From what has already been said, it is evident how important was the presence of the Patriarchal delegation in London. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in answer to the *locum tenens* of the Patriarchate, assured him that the delegation gave "a fresh strong life to the mutual friendly relations of the two Churches," while the Lambeth Conference estimates as great the help given by the delegation to its Committee of Bishops, and finally that Committee acknowledges that "the presence in London of a Patriarchal delegation was of the greatest importance, as many important questions, both doctrinal and practical, were discussed at it." And although this Committee thinks that we are advancing firmly towards the object of final reunion, still it adds: "There is still much to be accomplished, that we need to know better and understand the position of each other. That from both sides explanations are necessary in order that, when the day should come for proposing Sacramental Inter-Communion, they should rest, on both sides, on principles of *broad toleration*; and the readiness also of each Church

to confine itself to its own practices and customs, not insisting upon the other complying with them."

The presence in London of this Patriarchal delegation had as a result the decision of the Holy Synod in Constantinople, under the Presidency of the Patriarch Meletius, to acknowledge the validity of Anglican Orders. Professor Comnennos on his return to Constantinople considered it wise to devote himself to the study of this question and published a special treatise on Anglican Orders. The conclusions arrived at in his treatise, which were taken into consideration by the permanent Committee on the relations between the two Churches, suggested to the Holy Synod the acknowledgment of the validity of Anglican Orders. The Synod, in acknowledging the validity of these Orders, communicated its decision to the other Autocephalous Churches in an Encyclical, and in a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury. In this letter the Patriarch says: "The Holy Synod has concluded that as before the Orthodox Church the ordinations of the Anglican Episcopal Confession of Bishops, priests and deacons possess the same validity as those of the Roman Old Catholic and Armenian Churches possess, inasmuch as all essentials are found in them which are held indispensable from the Orthodox point of view for the recognition of the Charisma of the priesthood derived from Apostolic succession." This decision, as the Patriarch points out in this letter, has not the significance of a decision of "the whole Orthodox Church," for which all the Autocephalous Churches must be in agreement; but "as a decision of the Primatial

See of the Orthodox Churches, it is not without significance, and is a step forward in that work of general Union which is agreeable to God." The Archbishop of Canterbury, in communicating the relative documents to the Canterbury Convocation, declared that the decision in itself does not authorize Inter-Communion or mutual ministrations ; but that its importance lies "in the preparation for future advances and in preparing the way for the possible regularization of Anglican ministrations to them (the Orthodox people), or of the offer of ministration on their part." The example of the Œcumenical Patriarchate was soon followed by the decisions of the Patriarchate of Jerusalem and Archbishopric of Cyprus relative to Anglican Orders. The Archbishop of Athens, Chrysostom, drew up a treatise in which he supported the validity of Anglican Orders. The delay on the part of the other Autocephalous Churches in following their example should be ascribed to their preoccupation with internal matters rather than to any hesitation with regard to the essence of the matter. As the decision had already been taken in Constantinople to call a Pan-Orthodox Synod, or Pro-Synod, the Autocephalous Churches which had not yet come to a decision formed the opinion that the question also of Anglican Orders and mutual ministrations in cases of necessity would be put on a proper basis when the relations of the Orthodox to the other Christian Churches had been regulated, as proposed in the Programme.

The last intercourse between Orthodox and Anglican representatives took place at Lausanne in August last year, at the Conference on Faith and Order.

However much the general character of this Conference, consisting of representatives of almost seventy Christian Churches, prevented that agreement appearing which had been reached on several points between our two Churches, yet whoever reads the minutes of the Conference, or above all followed the discussions in the special Committees, knows that the Anglican view, as long as it kept to Catholic lines, found its chief supporters in the Orthodox delegation. If the Orthodox delegation arrived at its well-known declaration, in which it refused all compromise, it did this because it found, as did the Patriarchal delegation before in London, that the proposed terms of agreement were so wide as not to be consistent with principles which the Orthodox Church considers to be fundamental.

In reviewing what has been already said above, we say that the relations between the two Churches, Anglican and Orthodox, which have been put on a sound basis by the friendly intercourse of the heads of both Churches and the deeper knowledge of the nature and position of each Church by their theologians, especially since the beginning of the present century, are becoming every day closer. This is shown not only by simple acts of friendliness, but by real compliance and tolerance in what does not touch Inter-Communion, such as, for the Orthodox Church at least, would a century ago have been considered as quite inconceivable. At that time in the East the idea prevailed that the Ecclesiastical body called the Anglican Church was no other than a Protestant branch which, as a remnant of

the ancient Church, preserved Episcopacy. Here perhaps, as elsewhere in the West, the Orthodox Church was considered as a dead branch of the ancient and undivided Church, which, while retaining some elements of its doctrine, was on the other hand a mass of superstitions which, owing to their greater number, prevented the distinguishing of the hidden kernel of truth within. Now, thanks to the endeavours made on both sides, the fundamental position of each Church has been examined and cleared of the former prevailing prejudices. But what are the prospects of the future of these relations? That is the point I wish to dwell upon before concluding my address.

III

HOPES AND FEARS

The Orthodox Church has always discriminated between intercourse and co-operation of the Churches and the union of them in faith and order. It considers unhesitatingly that the first is possible, even if each Communion retains untouched its own confession, after certain conditions have been fulfilled. These conditions are the cessation of Proselytism among Christians and the cultivation of a brotherly spirit between the different Churches like that which, according to St. Paul, must characterize all the members of one and the same Church. It is true that the object for which the Œcumenical Patriarchate sent its Encyclical in 1920 has not yet been realized in the manner in which it was conceived from the beginning. This is due to the fact that the different Churches either did not make its contents a

subject of special study, or did not communicate their opinions to the Œcumenical Patriarchate concerning the manner by which the proposal could be realized; or, finally, that the Œcumenical Patriarchate, owing to its own difficulties, could not return to the subject. Nevertheless, if one considers the willing and wide co-operation shown by the Orthodox Church in the movement for reunion, it cannot be denied that the policy of the Patriarchate since this Encyclical has been inspired by sympathy towards all the Christian Churches. And that this sympathy is more emphatically shown to the venerable Church of England is explained not only by the special relations into which it entered for the reasons given above, but also because the Orthodox Church cherishes the conviction that, in spite of all existing difficulties, the reunion with the Church of England in faith lies within the boundaries of possibility in a nearer future than with any other Church, except perhaps with the Old Catholics. What is the plan of co-operation in this League of Churches proposed by the Encyclical, each can conceive for himself if he studies the contents, which would make further remarks here unnecessary.

But the Orthodox Church, although she recognizes the preparatory character of this intercourse and co-operation for the work of reunion in faith and order, has always discriminated between them. It has always conceived of the Unity of the Church as Unity in faith in the fundamental doctrines of Divine Revelation as they were laid down in Scripture and Holy Apostolic tradition and have been confirmed by the decisions of the seven Œcumenical Synods

and the nine first centuries. It is therefore easy to understand why the Orthodox Church always advances the faith of the ancient and undivided Church as the model which every discussion with theologians of other Churches should take, and as the starting-point from which every discussion should proceed on the points, undefined formally, but which are accepted in the Orthodox Church on the basis of the Divine Revelation. As the whole content of Divine Revelation has not been defined authoritatively, but is taught and accepted on the authority of the Church, this fact offers great scope for theological discussion, not only among the Orthodox theologians, but between them and theologians of other Churches. Despite this, however, the Orthodox Church accepts as true members those only who declare their belief in its fundamental principles, and considers that they only have the right to partake of the treasure of its grace through its sacraments. As, therefore, the Orthodox Church holds that Unity presupposes dogmatic Unity also, for this reason, when the proposal was made that the Patriarchate should recognize the validity of mutual ministrations of Orthodox and Anglican in cases of necessity, while it recognized the validity of Anglican Orders, it reserved its opinion on this question, and postponed it to the judgment of a future Pan-Orthodox Synod. I simply mention the fact that certain isolated examples which were dictated by anomalous conditions and necessities must not be considered as precedents which abolish the rules prevailing in the Orthodox Churches.

From this it will be seen that the future direction of discussions between the two Churches must be the

following : By what means will be raised the existing dogmatic differences between them, and an agreement reached on a common confession of faith ? Before we reach this goal, let us not buoy ourselves up with the idea that a safe and enduring Union of the two Churches can be accomplished. To arrive at this goal, how many obstacles must be overcome ! On the Orthodox side, there is not only the difficulty of convening a Pan-Orthodox Synod in order to lay down, in the name of the whole Church, the general lines of such a procedure for Union ; but the need also for the preparation and enlightenment of the Orthodox people as regards what is essential or non-essential in the faith, and their instruction in the great advantages to be derived from the reunion of the Churches. For the removal of these obstacles not only requires time, but enlightened workers, full of zeal and devotion to the work of reunion. With regard to the obstacles on the Anglican side, may I, instead of mentioning these, be allowed to end my address with a short personal confession.

On my last journey to the East, when the question of the reunion of our Churches was raised, an Orthodox cleric said to me : “ It is evident that Unity in Faith is not a *sine qua non* in the Anglican Church ; for in that Church different views are held, not only in secondary matters but in fundamental matters of faith. The appeal of the last Lambeth Conference to all the Christians and the conduct of the English Church towards ecclesiastical bodies which had severed their continuity with the ancient Church, and finally the well-known discussions at the time of the revision of the Prayer Book, show clearly how

wide the conception of the Church is among Anglicans. What can further discussions avail, when there exists a radical disagreement between the two Churches on this fundamental point? If, on the other hand, the object of the discussion is to define the common teaching of the Faith, as a link uniting the two Churches to each other, and one of the debating parties has made advances to others on a much wider basis, does not any further discussion seem in vain? Let us therefore be content to cultivate friendly relations and intercourse with the Anglican Church also, and stop deceiving ourselves as well as others with hopes that Unity in Faith is possible."

I answered him thus: "I recognize in one way your doubts and I share your uneasiness, but I shall never reach your despair; you despair because you ignore the nature and constitution of the Anglican Church, and you have not followed at close quarters the slow but undoubted evolution of this Church. If you knew this Church from the moment of its emancipation from Rome; if you had studied the many struggles of some of its members to save what is truly Catholic in it; if you, through close touch, became persuaded of the sincerity of their intentions and the depth of their religious convictions, then despair would not have found a place in your heart. Why should we not think that a time is coming when the Catholic nucleus which always existed in the Anglican Church should not prevail over the whole body, so that it should appear in that form which would make reunion with our Orthodox Church possible? Meanwhile, the duty

of the Orthodox is not to break the definite bond which binds us to the Anglican Communion, but to help in such an evolution, through friendly intercourse and in a spirit of peaceful discussion. And finally, since the work of reunion appertains first to the glory of God and the prevalence of His Kingdom on earth, why should we not lay our hopes on Him, who is everything and in this also, as in the work of our religious edification ? ” So then, “ neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase ” (1 Corinthians iii. 7). *Oremus et laboremus.*

THE ANGLICAN CHURCH AND THE LUTHERAN CHURCHES OF SCANDINAVIA

BY VALDEMAR AMMUNDSEN, D.D., BISHOP OF
HADERSLEV, DENMARK

“**S**EEK ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness ; and all these things shall be added unto you ” (Matt. vi. 33). This may be our watch-word also in the question of Reunion. Before all discussions of Church polity we need a purely religious starting-point, a turn to God for humbly seeking His will. The central idea of Jesus is the Kingdom of God, His complete, all-embracing rule. All our conceptions are too narrow to exhaust it. It is future, breaking forth in the last day. And still it is already here, as a leaven claiming to penetrate the whole lump. It is the work of God, entirely out of our power, superhuman, miraculous ; and still we are called to be co-operators with our prayer : Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done on earth, as it is in heaven.

The Church is the God-ordered organ to promote this Kingdom. A great variety, also differences of rites and opinions, adds to the riches of the Church. No individual person, and even no single Church, is able to grasp the fullness of Christ as revealed in the

Gospel. Only together with all the saints may we apprehend what is the breadth and length and height and depth and know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge (Eph. iii. 18 *sq.*) ; to the manifold, or literally many-coloured, wisdom of God (Eph. iii. 10) must correspond a many-coloured Church. Uniformity is no Christian Ideal.

But unity is a Christian ideal ; nay, both a command and a privilege. And not less than a unity, which is a representation of the inner life of love in God Himself. The great mystery of the Holy Trinity is perfectly practical, working, creating, " that they all may be one ; even as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be in us : that the world may believe that Thou didst send me " (John xvii. 21). But if so, it is simply a matter of course, an effect of the just law of God, that the world is hindered from believing in Christ, and His Kingdom is delayed and hampered, when our differences devolve into dissensions which break our mutual communion.

But the way to reunion, embarrassed by misunderstandings of centuries, is difficult. Here is no short cut. Every false, premature step is a drawback, even as every true step, made conscientiously, with heart and soul, is, although perhaps small, a partial fulfilment of the will and the prayer of our Lord. The way to unity is principally the more excellent way of love. But in order to love one another we must love God in Christ. The love to the Father creates the love in His family. To Him and His Kingdom we must look. God and His Kingdom must be the common goal, attracting the eyes of all and making the feet move in the same direction.

From this point of view I have been glad to accept the invitation of your President to speak upon the relation between the Anglican Church and the Lutheran Churches of Scandinavia. The first condition is, that we know one another.

Here again the first steps naturally must be taken by us in Scandinavia. Why? Perhaps you will smile when I answer: because we, belonging to small nations, have the advantage of being forced to study foreign languages, and among them English. In fact, we have been slow enough in discovering the Anglican Church. In former centuries the outlook of our Churches was rather narrow, in the main limited to the Lutheran Churches of Germany. Still, Puritanism and the Evangelical movements in England have to some extent influenced corresponding parties in our countries; John Bunyan has been widely read and many English revival hymns have been translated, and the British Bible Society had a considerable influence in Denmark and Sweden. But the Anglican Church in her distinct character was only little understood. In my country, Denmark, one of the first to pay special attention to her was Grundtvig. About 1830 he went to England three times. His main object was to study Anglo-Saxon manuscripts; this great genius had discovered that in the old Anglo-Saxon sacred poetry there was a special Northern epic conception of Christianity as history, the great drama of redemption and victory. But in England he found more than old documents. He found a people, living, busy, combining in a strange manner conservatism and progress, rule and liberty. Although his utter-

ances are not always consistent, he also caught a glimpse of the inner structure of the Anglican Church. Inspired by him in many ways was my teacher and predecessor as professor of Church History in the University of Copenhagen, Dr. Fr. Nielsen. Although he never saw England, he found to a great extent his ideals in the Anglican Church. A friend not only of Dr. Nielsen but of Denmark was that noble scholar, the recently departed Dr. A. J. Mason. I never shall forget the day, twenty-six years ago, when Dr. Mason for several hours took me over the Cathedral of Canterbury, of which he was a Canon. Anglicanism as a living force flashed upon my mind, rallying into a living body the *disiecta membra* of my knowledge of her history and present state. As the venerable Cathedral itself, the principal Church of the Anglican Communion, is partly Norman, partly in the Transition style, partly in the Perpendicular, so the Anglican Church is herself a venerable Cathedral, to which the centuries, succeeding one another, have added their stones. The long line of Primates, from St. Augustine and Alphege, who was murdered by my countrymen, to Thomas Becket and Stephen Langton, from Cranmer to Temple, rose before the eyes of my soul. I understood your feeling that it is the same Church altogether, although the forms of worship have varied widely from time to time. I understood your ideal: a Church truly national, embodying and hallowing the spirit and history of the people, comprehensive, conservative, with deep reverence for the past, and still progressive, anxious to take up what God may reveal to us in our time.

Since that day I have loved the Church of England. Her services—of course according to the old Prayer Book—have been a comfort to me, not only in England, but also in Sicily, in the midst of Roman ceremonies. I love her comprehensiveness, which has been able to hold inside the same body old-fashioned Evangelicals with their fervour for personal conversion, High Churchmen, who have indeed made the Church lofty, Broad Churchmen who fearlessly take up modern problems.

Most of all I am indebted to your Church for two things. One is the vision of the *una sancta*, with the painful feeling that our schisms are not to be taken lightly, but as grievous sins; no scholar has given me so true an interpretation of the Epistle to the Ephesians as the Dean of Wells. And the other is the idea that Christianity means the practical redemption of mankind in social matters also, as we have been taught by the Christian Socialists, Maurice above all, and later by Westcott.

In my Church many, especially of our young clergy, have in later years come to appreciate your Church. The same is true for the other Scandinavian countries. I only mention the Archbishop of Upsala, and his son-in-law, Dr. Brilioth, who is perhaps the first scholar on the Continent as to Anglicanism, for the moment working as a professor in Åbo in Finland. There are in the northern countries not a few who would regard it as a severe loss to the universal Church should the Church of England be split up in the present crisis; we hope that she may be spiritually deepened through it.

But while a warm friend of the Anglican Church

I am perhaps still more a convinced servant of my own. Not as an advocate, feeling bound to defend even doubtful things about her, not as a slave tied by heavy chains, but as a child who wishes to show both reverent thankfulness and filial freedom to his mother. And now I will tell you something about our Scandinavian Churches.

The countries concerned are first the inner circle of Scandinavia : Sweden (6,000,000 inhabitants), Norway (2,800,000) and Denmark (3,500,000). Here the languages are so like one another that with a little practice a Dane will understand a Swede and vice versa, and the Norwegian—in its different forms—is between these two others ; so in Scandinavian Conferences everybody may speak his own tongue and be understood by the others. To the west we have Iceland (100,000 inhabitants), formerly a part of Denmark, since 1918 an independent state, but connected with Denmark under the same King ; here the language is more different, but educated Icelanders will speak Danish. To the east we have Finland (3,400,000 inhabitants). The tongue of the people belongs to quite another family, related to the Esthonian and Magyar languages ; formerly Swedish was dominant, and it is still the bridge to Scandinavia, but its sphere has been considerably diminished in Finland in later years. The Churches in Esthonia and Latvia very much desire intercourse with Scandinavia, but that is only possible through another language, such as German.

Our countries were Christianized in the period between 800 and 1100. Christianity came to us from the Franco-German Empire, but also from England.

Many vikings, wild and blood-coloured, but not without deep feeling for the mystery of life and death, bowed to "the white Christ" when they saw the mark He had stamped upon meek British or French Christians. Canute conquered England, but the stream from England consummated the Christianization of Denmark. In Norway the Anglo-Saxon influence on the Church order was especially strong. But to Sweden also, and even to Finland, English missionaries brought the Gospel.

The northern countries were first under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Hamburg—Bremen. But in 1104 they were made a separate province of the Church, with the Archbishop of Lund (then in Denmark, now in Sweden) as Primate. About fifty years later first Norway (with Iceland), then Sweden (with Finland), got their own archbishops.

Next to the Christianization the Reformation is the fundamental fact which gave our Churches the spiritual basis and the form they have retained since.

Of course political interests also strongly influenced our Reformation. But the principal factors, which explain the easy victory, were negatively the weakness of the medieval Church about 1500, positively the heart-convincing preaching of the Gospel.

The Church was outwardly rich and powerful, spiritually poor and weak. The Bishops were quite impotent as teachers, and they were less priests than secular landlords; several of them never received consecration, but remained *electi*. The connection with Rome was rather loose; the Danish Bishops indeed, ten years before the official Reformation, con-

sented to a practical cutting off of the tie between Denmark and the See of St. Peter. So the official Church would have slight authority against a deep religious message. In fact the Church herself had no message, no satisfactory help to offer to the religious need and the unrest of that generation.

But a real message was revealed to Luther through agonies of soul, which made him the prophet of his century, the Gospel of repentance, of inward, lifelong penitence, but still more of full, free grace in Christ. Gifted and zealous preachers brought this message to our nations. The Bible was translated, hymns in the languages of the people sprang up and became one of the most effective means for the evangelical mission. In Denmark Hans Tausen and his fellows caused a real revival, often of a deep personal character, especially in the towns. In Norway (with Iceland), then connected with Denmark, the Reformation was much more imposed from above, without a basis in personal conviction. In the complicated history of the Reformation in Sweden (with Finland) Olavus Petri stands as the most remarkable of all the Scandinavian Reformers, but the religious support from the people seems to have been less than in Denmark.

It was taken as a matter of course that the new order in the Church must be established by the king (Christian III in Denmark—Norway—Iceland, Gustaf Vasa in Sweden—Finland). And this was done thoroughly. In each country the whole nation was subjected to the new state of things. And although it took time, it can be said that the new Churches in fact became truly national. And so they are even

now. They have been intimately connected with the history of the people for centuries. Only about 2 per cent in each country do not at least officially belong to them. Upon them rests the privilege and the responsibility of being *the Church*.

In all these Churches the Reformation was decidedly Lutheran, although it took some time before this was officially established in Sweden. In fact the northern countries may be regarded as a stronghold of the Lutheran Confession.

From the beginning they were closely connected with German Lutheranism. But still our Churches were not quite of the same type as the German. For Luther and his true followers the primary duty was to proclaim the Gospel of grace, which the Reformers were convinced was the central message of Scripture, giving at the same time the highest honour to God and a firm consolation to troubled consciences. This doctrinal conception could give—and in fact, especially in the subsequent period of strict orthodoxy, gave—the Church a too theoretical stamp. But at the bottom there is a sound appeal to first principles and a valuable feeling that our main concern must be *truth*.

The questions of Church order then became of secondary importance. Nothing should be allowed which would impair the honour of God or was contrary to Scripture. But this given, different rites might be used. In fact, Luther himself did not wish to establish a brand-new form of worship, but to purify the traditional. The Lutheran Reformation in worship was much more conservative than the Swiss. And Scandinavian Lutheranism was again more

conservative than German. Englishmen are often astonished when they come into our Churches, which they know to be Protestant, and see altars, candles, vestments, copes, wafers, crucifixes, the sign of the cross, etc. These things never have come into disuse. For instance, while in this country episcopal copes have only been restored through the Catholic revival of last century, our copes are often old and have always been used at ordinations and Church dedications ; in Sweden Bishops also wear the mitre. But all these things to us are *adiaphora*. We have them, not as necessary, but as beautiful and adding to the dignity of worship. Therefore they never have been made a matter of dispute. With us they have no savour of Romanism at all.

Our ritual has been subject to several changes. At first it was richer, then it became somewhat impoverished. In modern time a fuller ritual has been restored in Sweden and Norway, to a smaller degree in Denmark. But we have another precious treasure : I venture the assertion that no Church has a richer hymnal than the Danish.

In our services preaching is of great importance. Our sermons have more of a personal appeal, less of rational and theological explication, than the Anglican. But besides the pulpit, we lay stress upon the Communion service. An Anglican friend of mine, who took part at the Eucharist in Danish Churches, said : " Your Communion service combines a High-Church ritual with the spirit of a Nonconformist prayer-meeting." Not in all Churches can we claim that high testimony. It may be said to be our aim. But we are quite outside your controversies of to-day.

Nobody thinks of making fasting communion a duty ; we also often celebrate in the evening, and we think this to be in the line of our Lord's Institution of a *Supper* and of the use of the primitive Church. Reservation we do not use. For the sick it is no necessity, as the priest is not bound to communicate himself when he consecrates, and we should not wish the sick to be deprived of the words of prayer and consecration. And Reservation for adoration in our eyes would be against the spiritual character of Christianity. Sacraments to us are not so much things as acts, acts of the worshipping Church, but still more acts of the God of our salvation.

Besides the more conservative form of worship another difference from German Lutheranism is the retainment of Episcopacy. A German theologian gives the testimony that while in Germany the Protestant Churches were reduced to departments of the State, so that even the idea of a real Church practically had been lost, that is not the case in Scandinavia ; although here also the Church was governed by the King, she still remained a *Church* ; and this difference he thinks is due to the fact that in Scandinavia the eminently religious office of Bishops was preserved ; this gave a check to the arbitrariness of the princes (O. Dibelius, *Das Jahrhundert der Kirche*, 5 Aufl., 1928, p. 29 *sq.*, and especially Nachspiel, 1928, p. 66 *sq.*). At any rate, it is quite certain that a Scandinavian Bishop is much less of a bureaucratic officer, much more of a minister in a religious sphere, than German Superintendents have been.

Scandinavian Bishops have a modest salary when compared with the medieval, which they succeeded,

also when compared with English Bishops. But the daily work of a Bishop in this country and in ours may be very much the same. Confirmation, however, which was established in the eighteenth century, is performed by the parish priest ; the principal thing about it is the foregoing religious instruction.

In all our countries the Churches are connected with the State. If this system is justified at all, it is so with us, where only very small minorities are outside of the Church.

The measure of self-government allotted to the Churches is varying. In Finland the Church Assembly definitely decides all questions of teaching and worship. Sweden also has a Church Assembly, but there such questions can come before the King in Council. In Denmark we have no Church Assembly, but local Councils of the congregations ; with us questions of doctrine and liturgy come before the King, but not before Parliament, although of course the parliamentary majority may in fact instruct the minister as to his advice to the King. In Norway the local Councils have less importance and Parliament deals more with details.

I wish I could give you an impression of the religious life in the different countries. In Sweden you would find a Church, venerable and dignified, in former times somewhat stiff, the result of which was a strong evangelical revival in opposition to the Church, which meanwhile in later years vigorously endeavours to deal with all the problems of the time and has played a great part in the œcumenical movement of recent years. In Finland you would see a people of serious piety with somewhat old-fashioned

forms. Denmark could show you a series of men who deserve to be known all over Christendom ; Martensen, in fact, has been so, and in later years Grundtvig on the one hand, Kierkegaard on the other, are felt to have a real message for our troubled time ; besides, you would find a singular combination of the system of an established Church and of free religious activities. In Norway, Hauge, more than a hundred years ago, stamped a mark of stern religion upon a large section of the farmers ; since then laymen have played a great part in the religious life, and to-day you would in this old and still young nation, struggling to find her own truly national way, be struck by the sharpness of the conflict between orthodoxy and modernism. Somewhat of the same you would find in far-away Iceland, together with touching testimonies of serious religious life in a poor and scattered population. But time only allows me to promise you interesting things, not really to show them. I must refer to the—unfortunately too scarce—English literature on this subject ; for instance, John Wordsworth, *The National Church of Sweden*, 1911 ; E. Gosse, *Two Visits to Denmark*, 1911 ; H. Begtrup, H. Lund and P. Maniche, *The Folk-High-Schools of Denmark and the Development of a Farming Community*, 1926 ; A. Lehtonen, *The Church of Finland*, 1927.

We have in our religious tradition a rich treasure. But against the evils and problems of the time we do feel inadequate and weak. There is, although meanwhile only in some circles, a rising feeling that we need co-operation and reunion with other Churches. With Lutheran bodies outside our countries we have already pulpit exchange and intercommunion. But

one of the Churches which can give us most is the Anglican. I for my part feel quite at home in her. I think of the Anglican Church as such, not of any party in her. We do not share the Low-Church fear of ceremonial beauty ; still less are we in sympathy with extreme ritualism. But what will be the position of your Church towards us ?

Here rises the problem of the "Apostolic succession." At the Reformation all the old Bishops were deposed. In Sweden the new Archbishop was consecrated by two Bishops, who had themselves been episcopally consecrated, one of them in Rome ; although the two consecrators were in their heart against the Reformation, and in a document declared the consecration, which they were forced to fulfil, to be quite invalid. In Denmark the new Bishops were consecrated by the friend of Luther Bugenhagen, who had himself only been ordained a priest. So a succession through laying on of hands by Bishops has not been preserved in Denmark. And Norway and Iceland depend upon Denmark. Finland shared the lot of Sweden, but in 1884 all the Finnish Sees happened to be vacant ; the new Archbishop then was consecrated by a professor of theology, who was himself a priest. On the other hand, the Bishops in the Baltic states have after the war received consecration by the Archbishop of Upsala.

I will tell you frankly what we think about this matter. The Swedish Church regards the Apostolic succession as a beautiful inheritance, but by no way as necessary ; she has the fullest intercommunion with the other Scandinavian Churches and with Lutherans outside Scandinavia as well. In recent

years we have had Scandinavian Bishops' Conferences for discussing the task before us, and there no difference is found between Bishops who have the Apostolic succession, and those who have not. Small circles, especially in Norway and Finland, may deplore the loss of the episcopal succession. But upon the whole we never think of this matter, unless just when we discuss it with our Anglican friends. We hold Episcopacy not to be a necessary, but a practical form of Church Government. On this basis we have a succession of office in the sense pointed out by your President in his Bampton Lectures to be the principle in the ancient Church (A. C. Headlam, *The Doctrine of the Church and Christian Reunion*, 2nd ed., 1920, p. 124 sq.). The medieval Sees have been preserved, with such modifications as the development has made necessary. Sweden has now an Archbishop and eleven Bishops, Finland an Archbishop and four Bishops. In Denmark there are nine, in Norway seven Bishops; the title of Archbishop has been abolished, but the Bishops of Copenhagen and of Oslo are *primi inter pares*. Iceland has one Bishop. The theory of a necessary succession by imposition of hands we regard as too mechanical, and not in accordance with the spiritual character of the religion of Jesus Christ, and as having no basis in the New Testament and primitive Christianity. We know that many of you hold an opposite view, but we also know that the conception of the ministry formerly put forward by that eminent scholar, Bishop Lightfoot, and corresponding to our own, is still held among you by competent authorities. That our orders and sacraments should not be valid is an idea which never

occurs to us. We think our religious past and present a sufficient proof that they are.

Another question is, whether we could accept some mutual consecration in order to remove barriers to reunion. With Sweden you have in the main already come to terms ; there the principal difficulty for you does not exist, although also Sweden has not episcopal confirmation. But what about the other countries ? I for my part find a discussion on the basis laid down by your President in his Bampton Lectures and elsewhere quite possible. But I have no authority to speak for my Church, still less for any other. And I know that some circles with us would hesitate, some would even be definitely opposed to such a course. They fear that it would be unavoidable, that some doubt should be thrown upon our past, and that there would be an intolerable difference between our present Bishops and those who had received consecration by the concurrence of English or Swedish Bishops. I do not share this fear. But unless it could be overcome, any attempt would be futile.

And my last, very important point is this: Real reunion will never be brought about if one Church requires another to surrender her own conviction or her past. Nor will reunion be possible through negotiations as between political powers. Mutual consecration, if it should be practised, should not be an outcome of negotiations, where each part is forced to make concessions, but it should be a natural, free and glad expression of an already existing friendly and brotherly feeling. To cultivate such a feeling, through intercourse and mutual help and fellowship

in prayer and worship as far as possible, is one of our first duties. I for my part rejoice that I have several times received the Holy Communion in your Church. If you are not prepared to receive it from our hands, that does not disturb me. "Let each man be fully assured in his own mind" (Rom. xiv. 5).

And as we did first, so we will do at the end. From all outward questions we will turn to the Most High and His work. And we will rest in the conviction that the real unity of the Body of Christ is not brought about by human discussions, but by His indwelling Spirit. Our highest duty in this important matter is not to guide, but to be guided. And often we must go slowly. "I do not ask to see the distant scene; one step enough for me."

ANGLICANISM AND LUTHERANISM

By DR. ADOLF DEISSMANN,¹ UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN

ON receiving last winter the honour of an invitation from the Lord Bishop of Gloucester to speak at the Church Congress at Cheltenham for about half an hour on the subject of Anglicanism and Lutheranism, I at once said to myself: A Church Congress is not a University Seminar for the study of Church History, and in half an hour it is impossible to concentrate even approximately the intellectual history of four centuries; all microscopic inspection, all learned detail must be excluded; nothing but a telescopic inspection is possible, which will allow only the very sharpest outlines to stand out; and even this inspection cannot be meant as a purely academic exercise in history, but as a contribution to the problem of the great movement which, God be thanked, is now going through Christendom like a mighty awakening—the movement for Christian reunion.

The Anglican Communion of the Old and New World takes in this movement a prominent share, and this fact assures me that I shall find here a friendly understanding of the view which I have taken of my subject.

¹ Translated from the German by Lionel R. M. Strachan, M.A., University of Birmingham.

“Anglicanism and Lutheranism”—I cannot begin this great subject without a glance at the ultimate historical backgrounds. What I mean is this ; there is an extremely ancient connexion between Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the Germanic Christianity of the Continent—a connexion of give and take. “There were,” says our eminent Church historian, Albert Hauck, “many thousands of German Christians before a single Anglo-Saxon knew anything of Christianity ; but by the time the English people had become Christian, almost the half of Germany was still heathen territory.” With this quotation from Hauck I would indicate that ultimate background I was referring to. While from Rome practically nothing was done, it was in large measure by the work of English missionaries that the heathen half of Germany was made Christian.

In fact the very heart of Germany, Thuringia, whence seven hundred years later the miner’s son, Martin Luther, arose, and where the German reformation had its first home, was specially indebted for the Gospel to men of England. St. Boniface, or Wynfrith of Crediton (to give him his English name), in his urgent appeal to his countrymen in the year 737 to support the mission to the Saxons, gives as one of the grounds of his missionary work this statement : “Have pity upon them ; for they too are wont to say : we are of one blood and of one bone.”¹ Greatly symbolic of these most ancient connexions between the Christian Anglo-Saxons and the converted “Old

¹ “Miseremini illorum, quia et ipsi solent dicere : De uno sanguine et de uno osse sumus,” Bonifatii Ep. 39, p. 107, Jaffé (46, p. 295, Dümmler).

Saxons" was the word *godspell*, which the English had coined so happily as a substitute for the Latin *evangelium*: it passed over into the Old Saxon language, though misinterpreted already, it is true, by popular etymology, so that it became in Old High German *gotspell*, the "good" news being thus appreciated by the Germans (as indeed by the English themselves) as if it were news "of God."

If this glance of ours into the ultimate historical backgrounds reveals to us common bonds of blood and of soul, as between mother and daughter, existing between Anglo-Saxon Christianity and the Germanic Christianity of the Continent, there is nevertheless one fact to be stressed. The Anglo-Saxon missionaries did not hand down to us a specifically "English" Christianity; they did not think of bringing us under the spiritual jurisdiction of England. As intermediaries they imparted to us what was common to Catholicism; they wanted to bring us under the jurisdiction of Rome—a condition of things which was in fact not actually attained until long afterwards.

As jointly Catholic churches the Church of England and the Church of Germany pursued their way through the Middle Ages. The enrichment of Germany by England was continued during this period, no longer by means of missionary work, but by the work of theological thinkers. But again these theologians did not represent a specifically "English" theology: their convictions were those common to Catholicism.

And it was on the basis of common Catholicism, at least in the opinion of the participants, that the great

world historic drama of the Reformation period at first began, and developed, from which Anglicanism and Lutheranism as independent powers in history were born. The impassioned contests between the two exponents of England and Germany, King Henry VIII and Martin Luther, are indicative of the bitterness of the birth-throes.

It is still a pre-Anglican English king who takes the field against a Luther who has not yet become a Lutheran; he does so as a champion of the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, as the "Fidei Defensor"—this being the honourable title that he received from the Pope for himself and his successors as a reward for his fighting against Luther. The documents relating to this conflict, which lasted from 1521 to 1527, have only recently, so far as Luther is concerned, been made completely accessible in the new critical edition of Luther's works published at Weimar. Taken together with the development that went on down to the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1531 and the Parliament of 1534 on the one side, and down to the *Confessio Augustana* of 1530 on the other side, the controversial pamphlets published by the King and by Luther show most clearly how strongly each of the two protagonists, in spite of all that was common to them in their assumptions and in their familiarity with the coarse polemical methods of their age, was rooted in the soil of his nationality, and how different were the motives that found expression in the two Reformations.

Adopting the phrase now current, "Faith and Order," we may say of the English Reformation that it was in its first stage more a Reformation in respect

of Order than a Reformation of Faith. Owing to the fortunes of the English king's personal life the problem of detaching England from the jurisdiction of Rome was with him first and foremost. In the personal experiences of the German reformer the religious question of Faith stood first and foremost. Jurisdiction is at stake in the one Reformation, and justification in the other—that is the contrast between the two Reformations at first. Luther's religious experience was, it is true, two hundred years later lived through over again by a great Anglican of kindred spirit, when, on the 24th of May, 1738, without himself becoming a Lutheran in consequence, John Wesley found peace through Luther's preface to the Epistle to the Romans. But King Henry's intellectual adviser, Thomas Cromwell, was hardly a kindred spirit to Luther. In that first period of the English Reformation, in the years when England was being liberated from the supremacy of the Roman Church, the religious question still takes a back place.

Connected with this is the fact that the English Reformation was originally aristocratic in character, and spread downwards, whereas the German Reformation was essentially democratic and spread upwards. The significance of the contrast between Henry and Luther is this: Behind the English Reformation there is the impassioned will of a ruler conscious of his own strength but able to count upon the immemorial instinct for freedom and independence which controls the English people, himself however remaining ultimately the decisive factor in the shaping of events. The heartfelt distress of an unknown man, a *homo novus*, rising from the anonymous masses, is

the propulsive force of the German Reformation, and this was immediately supported by a powerful popular movement of the European continent. Princes, it is true, played an important part more and more in the German Reformation, but they did not give the decisive impulse.

These characteristics of the English Reformation found legal expression when the Parliament of 1534 proclaimed the King as "the only supreme head on earth of the Church of England, called *Anglicana Ecclesia*." This was for the Church of England the crisis of her fate. The lots were cast for her, white and black, for centuries to come: all the advantages afforded her by the protection of the strong arm of the State, by increase of her authority, strengthening of her influence and security of her economic foundations, and above all by the organic connexion of the Church with the nation as a whole,—but also all the dangers which might arise, and with more and more likelihood as time went on, from dependence on alternating Parliamentary majorities, especially when those majorities consisted no longer exclusively of members of the Church of England.

In the northern and other countries of Europe Lutheranism took the same sort of paths as Anglicanism with respect to the constitution of the Church. Even in Germany we soon find the Churches relying strongly on the power of the princes: the ruler of the country is as such the *Summus Episcopus*. So it remained in Germany, without by any means everywhere resulting in a rigid State Church system in practice, down to November, 1918. Then, in that

stormy hour of the nation's destiny, the German Churches obtained their freedom from the State and secured it straightway on a legal footing by the framing of their new constitutions. Long before that, however, our State Church system had been mitigated by the introduction of the presbyterian and synodal constitution even in the Lutheran Churches. Thus the Churches, even before 1918, had possessed a large measure of self-determination.

Glancing at the parallel development of the Reformation Churches we find that the Churches which retained the episcopal office were at an advantage in one point as compared with those that concentrated it in the person of the sovereign while abandoning it as a practical institution. The episcopal Churches possessed in general, I think, a greater energy derived from consciousness of their continuity with the Church of all the centuries, as well as from a surer instinct for the spiritual character of the Church. The other Churches, although never forsaken of God while possessing the Gospel, were not unfrequently in danger of bureaucratization. In the great work of building up our German ecclesiastical constitution since 1918 the revival of the episcopal office has therefore been one of the great points in the programme. Almost all the German Churches have reintroduced it in the form of a constitutional episcopate, and some of them indeed already with the title of Bishop.

The great crisis in the fate of the Church of England silenced the old impassioned opposition between England and Lutheranism. The irony of history

decreed that Rome should now hurl her shaft of excommunication against the *Fidei Defensor* as fourteen years before against the Augustinian friar of Wittenberg. And so there comes about the completion of the great fact in world-history—the rise of national Churches, freed from Rome, in Western, Central, and Northern Europe; on the grandest scale in England, because here the national Church was not divided as it was our fate to be, owing to the multitude of small states in Germany. It was not till 1922, when the German Evangelical Church Federation was founded at Wittenberg, beside the grave of Martin Luther, that we succeeded in bringing the German Churches together, at least by way of federation, into a unity capable of effective action.

And now, after England had separated from Rome, the exchange between the English and the German Reformation which had been impossible so long as the opposition prevailed between the German Reformer and *King Heinz*, as Luther was fond of calling him, could at last begin. German Christians now had the opportunity to pay back their old spiritual debts of gratitude to England.

In this second stage of the history of the English Reformation, in which Faith stood first and foremost and Order (because already settled) took a back place, not only does the lively, active literary intercourse, which had hitherto been suspended, begin again—we also see English ecclesiastical leaders, such as Thomas Cranmer, coming to Germany, and German leaders, like Friedrich Myconius, visiting England.

The intimate exchange of opinions did not remain without visible fruit. This was seen most clearly, as

already earlier in Tyndale's translation of the Bible, so now in Coverdale's psalms, in the liturgy of the Book of Common Prayer, and in the various stages of the official Anglican declarations of faith down to the Thirty-nine Articles. Together with Calvinistic material there flowed over from Lutheranism an abundance of ideas and formulations, more especially from the *Confessio Augustana*. These things are so well known, that I need only hint at them. But here again Albert Hauck is certainly right in saying that, in spite of the great use made of the *Augustana*, which it is true has sometimes been given a Calvinist twist, and of other Lutheran documents, the Thirty-nine Articles are neither a Lutheran nor a Calvinist confession. They are an Anglican confession of faith.

And the same thing is true in increased measure of the Anglican Church in general as she went on to consolidate herself more and more. The *Ecclesia Anglicana*, it is true, is, historically considered, one of the great European Reformation Churches, but even under Henry VIII and Edward VI she was not an *ecclesia lutheranizans*. She is an English national Church: deeply rooted in the mother earth of the medieval and ancient Church, rescuing with intelligent sympathy, even amidst the chaos of the period of revolutionary strife in which she originated, much of the best inheritance of that sacred previous age, especially in constitution and in ecclesiastical custom; but at the same time opening ear and heart to the voice of God in the Reformation and adopting the best that was then rousing the soul of the West by way of protest and confession emanating from Wittenberg and Geneva.

In these original characteristics of the Anglican Church, characteristics which we may describe as a *complexio oppositorum* in the best sense of the phrase, there is indicated already the destiny which Church history at large has appointed her to-day : the destiny of being the mediating Church, the " bridge Church " between Latin and Greek Catholicism on the one side and world-Protestantism on the other.

After the great national Churches of Europe that broke away from Rome had become consolidated, the official relations between the Anglican Church and the Lutheran Churches of the Continent were on the whole not very important. But just as the English Dissenters were strongly and directly influenced from the Continent, especially from the Calvinistic quarter, so too there exists between Anglicanism and Lutheranism with respect to the practice of their respective affirmations of life a significant *parallelismus membrorum*, and not rarely also a gratifying reciprocity of influence.

Even if we take a very telescopic view we are struck by the fact that all the young national Churches fulfilled one great mission in their respective countries, viz. the creation of a national Bible. In the history of the Bible the sixteenth century represents the same kind of culmination as did the translation of the Semitic Old Testament into Greek and the translation of the Greek New Testament into Latin and Syriac. That the Danish farmer should receive his Bible in Danish, the Polish nobleman in Polish, the Swedish soldier in Swedish, the German citizen in German, the British colonist in English, and that

the whole liturgical life, as indeed the whole popular education of all these nations should find a backbone in the national Bibles—these are some of the very great facts in the history of Christianity. Thus there arose and still exists an invisible bond of community of soul between all these Churches, though they have often gone their own paths side by side in isolation—a bond as tender as it is firm. If it is impossible to call all these Churches “Protestant,” they are all “Bible Churches.” Here we see, especially in the prolific history of German and English Bible translation and Bible distribution, a parallelism of great importance. The national Bibles do not keep the Churches of the Reformation apart: they bring them together, constituting as they do the broad foundation of the common heritage from the earliest era. Many of you will, I daresay, have experienced something similar to what happened to me at the Bethesda Conference at Copenhagen in 1922. I understood very little indeed of the language of Grundtvig, Kirkegaard, and our friend Bishop Ammundsen. But in the early morning I understood Danish very well when I opened the Danish New Testament that was placed ready for the visitors in the room of my hotel. My advice to you all is: If you want to become acquainted with some foreign Church, begin by reading the New Testament of that Church.

Closely connected with this there is, secondly, the mutual enrichment of English and German theology, chiefly no doubt in the departments of Biblical research and systematic theology. Professor Wilhelm Vollrath, of Erlangen, has recently presented us with a valuable collection of material on this subject.

Here truly, I can, to my delight discover no boundary line between Anglicans and Nonconformists. I count it one of those dispensations of my own life for which I must be most thankful to God, that my life as a student has from early years been greatly enriched by friendly contact with British theologians of all sorts of Churches ; and it is a special pleasure to me to have been privileged to take part with my dear friend, the Dean of Canterbury, in the organization of the Conference of German and English Theologians at Canterbury in 1927 and on the Wartburg in 1928. What high tension of intellect those theologians of the two countries, most of them of the younger generation, displayed at the conferences, and into what wealth of constructive criticism and mutual stimulation was it transformed ! After these impressions of my own I can understand more readily than I should have done what was said to me a few weeks ago at the " Faith and Order " Conference at Prague by a very influential leader of German Lutheranism. What interested him most, he said, in " Faith and Order " was the question, " What can I learn from the Anglicans ? "

A third positive parallelism is observable in the sphere of spiritual life and Christian practice. Here too, in spite of all the lack of official steps taken by the Churches as such, there is a real community of give and take. I can here, it is true, only mention the main departments by their current names : revival and after-care of soul-life, home and foreign missions, social work. It is well known how greatly John Wesley, whom I hold to be still deserving of a place in the Anglican calendar of saints, was inspired

by Zinzendorf and Luther. On the whole, however, the effects of England on Germany and other Protestant regions in the field of spiritual life seem to me to have been greater than our effects on England. The fact must certainly not be forgotten that the cruel fate of the Thirty Years' War threw Germany back many, many years in her intellectual and spiritual development, while England at the same time was experiencing a period of high national culture.

Finally, I believe there is parallelism to be seen with respect to the movement for reunion. The impulse towards reunion of the Church of Jesus Christ, which is so marked in the Church of England, finds in our German Church history a practical analogy in the nineteenth-century movement towards home reunion, which, though but little known abroad, is nevertheless of very great significance. As early as 1817 this movement in Prussia, Baden, Nassau, and other German Churches led to a union of the Lutheran and Reformed Churches in one single Church, in which the two main types of the Continental Reformation were not absorbed but rather, in spite of several splittings-off, went hand in hand as brothers.

Our inspection would be incomplete if we failed to glance at two instances of an official *rapprochement* between Anglicanism and Lutheranism. One was at least an experiment of great interest. The other constitutes an advance in ecclesiastical law of unusual importance with respect to the future of the movement for reunion.

It was a very curious episode in the official relations of Anglicans and Germans that the nineteenth

century witnessed in the foundation of the Prusso-Anglican bishopric of St. James at Jerusalem, as proposed by King Frederick William IV of Prussia. I was looking not long ago at the memorandum addressed by the learned diplomatist, Chevalier Bunsen,¹ on July 25th, 1841, by order of the King, to the Primate of All England, Archbishop William Howley. The document sounds fantastic to-day in several details, but in many of its fundamental ideas it is a great confession of the unity of Christendom. And some of it has a truly prophetic ring. The same is true of the Statement by the Anglican Primate, in which he expressed the hope that the foundation of the bishopric would pave the way to a considerable unity "of discipline as well as of doctrine between our own Church and the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant Churches of Europe." Unity "of discipline as well as of doctrine"—that is indeed the programme of "Faith and Order." One can say of the Primate of All England, as was said in the Gospel of St. John, that "being high Priest that year he prophesied" (John xi. 51).

The Prusso-Anglican bishopric of Jerusalem came into being, as is well known, and lasted from 1841 till 1886. It became especially well known throughout wide circles of international Christendom through the piety of Bishop Samuel Gobat.

When the joint Anglo-German bishopric was abolished in 1886, it did not disappear entirely from the sight of the faithful in Jerusalem. There still exists to-day its lasting and beneficent inheritance,

¹ Christian Carl Josias Bunsen (1791–1860), the friend of Queen Victoria and the Prince Consort.

the joint "Protestant English-German Cemetery on Mount Zion in Jerusalem," under the management of a committee whose chairman is the Anglican Bishop of Jerusalem, the vice-chairman being the Provost of the German Evangelical Church of the Redeemer. This goodly heritage has survived even the storms of the last twenty years. I recently had occasion to read the last official German report of the Cemetery. The writer of the report sums up his verdict by saying that the joint administration of the Cemetery is proceeding now, as always, in the spirit of peace. And thus under the protection of Anglican and German Churches our dead are sleeping their quiet sleep in the holy earth of Jerusalem, in expectation of the resurrection morning, and it seems to me as if these our dead on Mount Zion were reminding us who are alive, German and English Christians, to seek evermore the way of fellowship.

And now the twentieth century has witnessed the advance—to which Bishop Ammundsen has already briefly referred—denoted by the official establishment of intercommunion between the Anglican Church and the Lutheran Church of Sweden. I am indebted to the Archbishop of Upsala for a short summary of the facts. Sweden had close connexions with the English Church from the time, in the eleventh century and later, when English missionaries laid down their lives for Christianity in Sweden. The Swedish liturgy still contains fragments of the Sarum Use, for instance in the consecration of bishops. At a time when the Oxford Movement had brought about a certain isolation of the Anglican Church,

negotiations were opened on the initiative of England which led to the following result :—

Since the Lambeth Conference of 1920 and the Council of Swedish Bishops in 1922 there exists intercommunion between the Church in Sweden and the Church of England, and it is now permissible to exchange pulpits, churches, etc., of course on condition that the particular clergyman and the particular bishop retain responsibility in every case and are therefore able, at discretion, to allow the use of the church or not to allow it.

Intercommunion was solemnly confirmed by the presence of two English bishops at the consecration of two Swedish bishops on September 19th, 1920. Various invitations from England to the Archbishop of Upsala to send a Swedish bishop or two Swedish bishops to take similar part in an episcopal consecration in England could not be accepted owing to practical difficulties until last year, when, in November, 1927, the Bishop of Hernösand, Dr. Ernst Lönegren, took part in an episcopal consecration in Canterbury Cathedral.

What is the significance of this fact, the establishment of intercommunion between the Church of England and the Church in Sweden ?

Something quite extraordinary : an officially recognized Church fellowship between Anglicanism and Lutheranism. The Swedish Church is here with her right shoulder touching the left shoulder of the Church of England, which for her part is standing shoulder to shoulder with Catholicism on the right, just as the Swedish Church is linked up on the left with world-

Lutheranism, numbering seventy million souls, and through Lutheranism with universal Protestantism at large. The intercommunion of the Anglicans with the Swedish Lutherans is a big item among the assets of the œcumenical movement of the present day; it signifies a constructive deed, coming after many words.

What is its significance in particular within the "Faith and Order" movement, in which the Anglican Communion takes such special interest, and to which it has rendered signal service? My answer is as follows: At the present stage of the movement the only thing is for the separated Churches to begin to become acquainted with one another, in things they have in common as well as in their differences. For this purpose they must, as was done with so much blessing at Lausanne in 1927, come together and talk with each other. In the next few years above all in fairly small groups. They must therefore find out the paths of approach to each other; where gorges and foaming torrents interrupt the road they must find bridges in order to reach each other. If the Anglican Communion is specially the bridge towards Catholicism, Swedish Lutheranism is the bridge to Protestantism. These two bridges, however—and here lies the special significance of Anglo-Swedish intercommunion for the œcumenical movement of the present day—these two bridges are themselves connected.

To adopt another figure: the paths of the Churches to one another are like the network of lines composing a great system of airway traffic, which suffers, it is true, from the one defect that Rome, of her own

deliberate choice, still closes her aerodrome to aviation. Apart from this everything is as it should be : we can reach each other without difficulty. From the Orthodox East to Canterbury, from Canterbury to Upsala, from Upsala to Wittenberg and Geneva, to New York and Tokyo. But all this network of œcumenical traffic is held together by the line from Canterbury to Upsala, the line connecting Anglicanism and Lutheranism with one another.

Ladies and Gentlemen, I have done. But I may be allowed perhaps to add a personal word of my own. The Protestant Churches of the Continent, Lutheran, Reformed, and United, have been following the events of the most recent history of the Anglican Church with ardent interest. It is not my business to take part in the discussion of this domestic development of British affairs. But I may perhaps be allowed to say, as my personal conviction, that, to the extent of such knowledge as I can claim of Anglicanism in its mighty past and in the abundance of its spiritual forces and gifts at the present day, I look forward entirely hopefully to the future of the Church of England. And therefore I bid you from a heart full of confidence and sympathy, *Sursum corda !*

RELATIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNIONS

BY THE LORD SANDS

THE general subjects of discussion to which I am asked to contribute cover a wide field—"Relations with other Communion and Reunion in the Mission Field." I refer to the latter only in a word. To Presbyterians in Scotland that matter is full of interest, for we have borne some part for more than a century in the work of foreign missions, we are deeply interested in that part of the Church's work, and we find in that interest one of the well-springs of our Church's spiritual life. At Lausanne and at Jerusalem during the past year missionaries of many Churches and of many races were insistent in the appeal to the home Churches to place no obstacles in the way of the closing of their ranks ; not to export our differences, which to us may mean much, but are so small and yet so embarrassing in the far-flung mission field. I leave that matter, however, to others more competent from personal knowledge to deal with it.

Turning now to the question of relations with other communions, I take it that your desire is that, despite all differences, there should be a good understanding among the communions which acknowledge

one Lord, a good understanding which may lead ultimately to reunion. But if there be a good understanding, it is, as the Bishop of Gloucester pointed out to me when he invited me to come here, very desirable that there should be an understanding in a slightly different sense of that term, viz.: that we should each of us understand the other's position. In that view I think I can most usefully employ the moments assigned to me in trying to present to you the Presbyterian position.

The first step towards understanding is the removal of misunderstanding. There may possibly be among some of you a certain measure of misunderstanding as to the Presbyterian position, and it may help to remove this if I refer to two attitudes of mind prevalent to a certain extent, though by no means universal, in your communion to which Presbyterians take exception.

The first of these is the attitude of mind which divides Christians into Catholics and Protestants. That, of course, opens up a wide field of discussion into which I shall not adventure. I content myself by stating that Presbyterians refuse to accept that division if it implies, as in many cases it is meant to imply, that Presbyterians are content to repudiate catholicity or acquiesce in any nomenclature which assumes that they are indifferent to catholicity. The Church of Scotland, the Mother-Church of Presbytery in the Anglo-Saxon world, had recently occasion deliberately to formulate its doctrinal position in the Articles, adopted by the Church, and embodied in the Schedule to the Church of Scotland Act, 1921. Article 1 begins with the affirmation,—

“The Church of Scotland is part of the Holy Catholic or universal Church,”

and the same Article declares the adhesion of the Church to the “Catholic faith.” It is open, of course, to any other Church, or any party in any other Church, to dispute this claim to catholicity, but it does not make for conciliatory discussion to impute to others repudiation of what they claim. So far from repudiating catholicity, the Church of Scotland has constantly claimed it ever since the Reformation.

The second attitude of mind to which Presbyterians take exception concerns another scheme of division. That is the scheme which divides the Churches in this country, other than the Roman, into two distinctively marked groups—the Anglicans and the others. In England, though of course not in Scotland, the familiar terminology is the Church of England on the one hand and the Free Churches on the other. The Church of England—you as belonging to that Church understand. The others—well, there may be microscopical differences between them which no plain Anglican can profess or be expected to understand, but they are all in one basket; they are one group, and that group is clearly marked off as a common group from the Church of England. Now, with all respect for other denominations with which we are so taken to be identified and all admiration for their good work, Presbyterians dislike being thus “slumped.” An intelligent stranger would find no such dividing line as I have indicated. On the contrary, if he looked carefully into the matter, he would find that fundamentally Presbyterians have much

more in common with the Church of England than with some of the Churches with which they are thus classified as a common group.

This proposition leads me at once to a very brief statement of the Presbyterian position. At the Lausanne Conference there were deemed to be four great subjects, a common understanding upon which was felt to be a necessity preliminary to union :

(1) The Faith of the Church, (2) the Nature of the Church, (3) the Ministry, (4) the Sacraments. To these I may add a fifth, (5) the Government of the Church. A single word as to the Presbyterian position under these heads.

(1) Faith or Doctrine—Presbyterians adhere to the Catholic faith formulated in the Catholic creeds, reaffirmed in the Westminster Confession, and of new reaffirmed Articles recently presented by the Church of Scotland to Parliament, to which I have already referred.

(2) The Nature of the Church. According to the Presbyterian conception the Catholic visible Church is—I quote from the Westminster Confession—"the Kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, the house and family of God. Unto this Church Christ hath given the ministry ordinances and oracles of God for the gathering and perfecting of the Saints in this life to the end of the world, and doth by His own presence and spirit according to His promise make them effectual thereunto." Needless to say that, according to this conception, the Church is not a voluntary association, but is a divine institution clothed with divine authority. The visible Church is composed of its members,

but it is not a mere aggregation of these members. It has its own independent life, and it is something more than all its members. The sons of God have not been left either at the mercy of individualism or with no guidance or control other than the rules or the conventions of an association into which they have banded themselves together. "The Church"—I quote again from the Church of Scotland Articles—"receives from the divine King and Head alone the right and power subject to no civil authority to adjudicate finally in all matters of doctrine, worship, government and discipline in the Church."

Such is the Presbyterian conception of the Church.

(3) The Ministry. According to Presbyterian teaching, the holy ministry in the Church is of divine institution. Ordained ministers of the Church, as stewards of the mysteries, derive their authority not from the people by selection or election, but from the Head of the Church operating through the Church which ordains them to the sacred office. Ordination is by the authority of the Presbytery as a Court of the Church and is conferred with the laying-on of hands of Presbyters who have been similarly ordained. It belongs to the office of the Presbyter so ordained to administer the sacraments, to preach the Word, to exercise pastoral care of the flock to which he is called, to bless the people from God, and along with lay elders to rule in the Courts of the Church.

(4) The Sacraments. According to Presbyterian doctrine, the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are real means of grace, not merely symbolical ceremonies. Said the first Scottish Reformers :

“We utterly condemn the vanity of those who affirm sacraments to be nothing else but naked and bare signs.” Baptism is not merely the solemn admission of the baptized persons or infant into the visible Church, but is also the seal of his engrafting into Christ by the Grace of the Holy Spirit. Again, Presbyterians believe in the real Presence in Holy Communion. Doubtless they reject Transubstantiation, but equally do they reject Zwinglianism. “We confess and undoubtedly believe,” says the Confession of 1560, “that the faithful in the right use of the Lord’s Table do so eat the body and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus that He remains in them and they in Him.” The Lord is present in Holy Communion, not indeed in a corporal or carnal manner—to use the old expression—in the bread and wine, but none the less objectively and effectually for the nourishment of the souls of the communicants, present in a sense mysteriously more intimate even than that Presence which He has promised wherever two or three are gathered together in His name.

(5) Church Government. The Presbyterian system recognizes order and authority in the government of the Church. But the authority is that of a hierarchy, not of individuals, but of Church Courts in whose deliberations lay elders as well as ministers have a voice—the Kirk Session for the congregation, the Presbytery for the district, the Synod for the province, and the General Assembly for the nation. The Church Court is the ecclesiastical superior, exercising authority as absolute as that of any prelate, and every minister and office-bearer owes it obedience. Canonical obedience is one of the ordination vows of

the ministry. There is no insistence upon strict uniformity, minor divergencies are often tolerated, but if any teaching or practice prohibited by the ecclesiastical superior were persisted in, the offence of such teaching or practice if not utterly heinous would sink into insignificance as compared with the offence of disobedience.

Having now stated the Presbyterian position in regard to what appear to be matters of most importance, one naturally in this Congress asks in what respects does it differ from the Anglican. There are different ecclesiastical schools in both communions and there are, as between the two communions, many divergencies in practice, rites, and ceremonies, as is indeed inevitable after nearly four centuries of separation. But, broadly speaking, in relation to possible reunion there are, in my view, only two important differences—ordination and Church government. Anglicans hold that episcopal ordination is essential to validity, or, at all events, to regularity. Presbyterians hold that ordination is by Presbyters. But here there is a discrepancy in relative standpoint. The interposition of the Bishop is from the Anglican standpoint essential. From the Presbyterian standpoint the interposition of the Bishop is not fatal. In the case of a Presbyterian minister who sought admission to the ministry of the Church of England episcopal ordination would be deemed essential. On the other hand, a Priest of the Church of England ordained by a Bishop and Presbyters who, as has happened, sought admission to the ministry, say, of the Church of Scotland, would not

be reordained by Presbyters acting without a Bishop. His orders would be regarded as valid and regular.

The other difference is in regard to the government of the Church, but into this I do not enter. If one confines one's outlook to this country there are great and obvious differences. But I shall not be so rash as to attempt to define the Anglican position, because I do not presume to determine how far the present position is the expression of an ecclesiastical theory of Church government, or how far, on the other hand, it is an historical legacy.

Statements of differences clear the ground for the consideration of the problem of reunion, but they do not necessarily open up the way: on the contrary, they may disclose some insuperable bar. A single word in this relation as to the two outstanding differences between the Anglican and the Presbyterian positions to which I have already referred—ordination and Church government. I do not think that either difficulty need prove insuperable. I speak only for myself, but, as it seems to me, he must be not only a very sanguine but also a very foolish man who regards union as attainable within this century—I had almost said within this age—on any basis other than the maintenance in some form of the historic episcopate. No doubt there are deep-seated traditionary prejudices to be overcome, but these, I believe, will yield, subject, however, to one condition, viz.: consideration for the position of non-episcopally ordained ministers in the union generation. One generation of the clergy and their scruples may seem a comparatively small matter in relation to so great a movement as Christian reunion. But it is not a small matter. It

may be a vital matter. For one generation, be it this generation or be it the next, must negotiate reunion, and to many of the negotiators the matter of their own orders will be crucial.

The second matter of serious divergence to which I have referred—government of the Church of Bishops on the one hand, or by Church Courts upon the other, need not, I think, be regarded as presenting insuperable difficulties. There are movements in the Church of England, with which you are more familiar than I am, tending in the direction of representative government, lay as well as clerical. On the other hand, there is in the Church of Scotland and in other Presbyterian Churches a growing sense of the need of the revival of the ancient Presbyterian office of the provincial superintendent. But ere I pass from this, that I may hold the balance even, let me add that in my view reunion on the basis of the government of the Church by an autocratic prelacy without representative synods or courts is as far away as a reunited Church without an episcopate.

Christian reunion is at present near the heart of many in nearly all the Churches of the world, nearer than it has been at any time since the Reformation. But the aspiration, though it has gained force in recent years, is not new. There has never been a time when permanent separation was recognized as being in accordance with the purpose of God for His Church. Hitherto and down to very recent times steps towards reunion, or even towards the serious consideration of the problem, have been barred by the dominance in each communion of the idea, "We are the people and wisdom will die with us."

Reunion is doubtless desirable, but the only kind of reunion which is contemplable is that everybody else should agree to become exactly as we are. The accents of the advocate of reunion has been that of St. Paul's exclamation: "I would that not only thou, but all that hear me to-day, were both almost and altogether such as I am." A reunited Church must be our Church exactly as it is only larger.

Now this idea is not dead. It still holds undisputed sway in the Roman communion, and it still has a great practical hold upon the minds of many in all communions. But signs are not wanting that it is breaking up. If I may venture upon an illustration from my own country, the two great Presbyterian Churches in Scotland have intermittently discussed reunion for sixty years. But the idea upon each side was that of the one coming over to the other, the one adopting in all respects the standpoint of the other. Nothing came of it so long as this attitude was maintained. But a more excellent way has been found. In Scotland, the two Churches are about to be reunited, not upon any scheme of coming over or surrendering, but on the basis of accepting and incorporating what is best in the ideals and traditions of both.

Sacrifice has, no doubt, an important place in religion, but in relation to union the idea of sacrifice does not open up a hopeful avenue. Our minds must be concentrated, not upon what we are going to give up, not upon what we are going to lose, but upon what we are going to gain and what we are to be privileged to give, what we are each going to bring with us to a reunited Church.

The religious life of our country flows in many different channels. There are high banks between these channels which divide the waters. We shall labour in vain if we seek to divert these streams from their courses and turn them all into our own favoured channel. No. We must strive to lower the banks that divide the streams with humble prayer that the Holy Spirit will move upon the face of the waters and find for the River of God one great channel for the spiritual refreshment of the land, and the hastening of the promised day when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the Kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

ANGLICANISM AND NONCONFORMITY

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF
HACKNEY AND NEW COLLEGE, LONDON

MAY I first of all express my sincere appreciation of the privilege and honour of this opportunity of addressing the Church Congress as a representative, in some measure at least, of English Nonconformity, and also my cordial gratitude to the Chairman, the Bishop of Gloucester, by whom the gracious invitation was extended to me. As one who is profoundly convinced that the unity of the Church, the body of Christ, should be made manifest to the world in as frequent fellowship in worship and as constant partnership in service of all its living members as is possible, I most heartily welcome the invitation, and my pleasure is increased because it comes through one with whom for many years I have had close and friendly associations. In using this opportunity as best I can, so as to justify your kindness, I shall not simply repeat amiable platitudes about Christians loving one another, even if I had the qualifications to do so, but shall frankly face the present situation as I apprehend it; as, happily, the spirit which prevails among the churches is now one in which it is possible to discuss differences as well as affirm agreements. May I in the first place remind you

of the stages of the movement towards closer, more intimate relations among the churches ; and in the next place confess some of the hindrances, although they do not seem to me to be insuperable for Christian faith, hope and love as sustained by the Spirit of God ?

I. Although prior to that fateful year 1914 there had been approaches, yet it was in the period of suffering, sorrow, anxiety and loss, 1914-1918, that the churches were more closely associated in facing the common task and danger. Happily the associations of war survived in peace, and became extended from the national to the international range.

(1) In Constance, on the eve of the Great War, the World Alliance for promoting international friendship through the churches made a small beginning under the initiative of Mr. I. Allen Baker, a member of the Society of Friends. Resuming its activities in 1918, under the devoted and capable guidance of Sir Willoughby Dickinson, it has in Great Britain assumed a fully representative character in the British Council, of which the first President was the late Bishop of Oxford, and which has now as its President the Bishop of Ripon. Friendship, however, is not most worthily and fitly promoted by an avoidance of quarrels, great as have been the services of the World Alliance in dealing by means of Conferences with threats to peace in different parts of Europe where the religious and national minority problems are causing bitterness and estrangement. Partnership in life and work is a surer and better way of achieving friendship.

(2) In close connection with this movement for world-peace there arose the proposals for a Conference

at Stockholm on Christian Life and Work, of which the guiding personality was Dr. Söderblom, the Archbishop of Upsala, whose church is closely allied with the Protestant churches in its Lutheran doctrine, and with Anglicanism in its possession of an historic episcopate which can make good its claim to be in the apostolic succession. That Conference appointed a Continuation Committee, of which the Bishop of Winchester was last year President, which is active in many directions promoting co-operation. An Institute for Social Research to guide the churches in their social service has been established in Geneva, and a trilingual quarterly, *Stockholm*, is being published. Each meeting shows progress towards mutual understanding, confidence, and helpfulness among the representatives of different communions and different nations. In this indirect way the cause of peace is being promoted as effectively as in the more direct efforts of the World Alliance.

(3) In the discussions at Stockholm it was discovered that in the treatment of practical questions of Christian life and work it is impossible altogether to exclude theological and ecclesiastical matters. Although the Faith and Order Conference at Lausanne in 1927, which in its initial stages owed everything to the devotion and labours of Robert Hallowell Gardiner, and which has since his death enjoyed the advantages of the wise and kind leadership of Bishop Brent, was projected in 1910, and although some preparation for it took place in the informal conversations between Anglicans and Nonconformists, of which two *Interim Reports* appeared, to trace the influence of which on further discussions would be a most

interesting study; nevertheless it is generally agreed that the Christian fellowship, experienced at Stockholm by many who were also at Lausanne, produced a more genial atmosphere at the very start in Lausanne than had been possible at the beginning in Stockholm. To the result of Lausanne I shall return.

Meanwhile this may be said in general about these three complementary movements, symbolized by the place-names, Constance, Stockholm, and Lausanne, that there are several hundred men, leaders in almost all the communions of Christendom, who are friends, who have realized their common brotherhood in Christ, despite differences and even divisions of nation and Church, and who are not only resolved to do what they can to preserve peace among the nations, but are also convinced that the Churches of Christ must be drawn more closely together in life and work, faith and order, so that the unity of the Church, the body of Christ, should be made more manifest to the world. It is true that the churches whom these men represent, while not indifferent, are not enthusiastic about any of these movements. The rank and file, and not a few even of the captains, have yet to be captured for these enterprises. And one of the tasks of those whose privilege it has been to share in these movements is to interest by educating the communions to which they belong.

As one who has had a share in all these movements, and who believes in them heart and soul, mind and strength, I venture to appeal for the interest and support of the Church Congress. May I add a reason? A short time ago there was held in Germany a conference, in which all Protestant theological

tendencies and schools were represented, the first of its kind ; and the President confessed that it was the co-operation in international movements of the theologians of different types that had suggested the possibility of such a gathering in Germany itself. May not common interest and effort in these international movements bring us as Anglicans and Nonconformists nearer to one another at home ?

II. But while, as believing in the promises and the purpose of God, we may be *idealist* in our hopes, we must, as recognizing the agency of man, also be *realists* as regards the facts of the present situation ; and at first sight of the facts our hopes may be moderated, but need not be abandoned.

(1) The first discouragement I must mention is the response of the Nonconformist churches to the appeal of the Lambeth Conference to all Christian people. Appreciating and grateful for that inspired Christian declaration, I at once recognized the difficulties which it would present to Nonconformists, and wrote an article in the *Constructive Quarterly* setting them out in order. The conversations at Lambeth Palace between the Anglican and Nonconformist representatives, appointed, not to negotiate, but to elucidate what was obscure, to define what was indistinct, did remove some of the difficulties. The crux of the whole discussion was the status of non-episcopally ordained ministers, as the proposal of episcopal ordination *sub conditione* was one which the representatives of Nonconformity found themselves unable to accept. We Nonconformists fully recognize that the Anglican representatives could not go beyond the conditions proposed in the Lambeth appeal, and

that any step that might bring the two sides nearer must wait for another Lambeth Conference. We Nonconformists must ask our Anglican brethren to accept our assurance that it is no *amour propre*, no pride in our own orders, that makes it impossible for us to think of a second ordination, however qualified. It is the conviction that we should dishonour our Lord by doubting or denying even in appearance the sufficiency of His gift of grace in our ordination to the ministry of His Church. We are grateful that some Anglicans, among whom may be reckoned the Bishop of Gloucester himself, do fully recognize the validity of our conviction. In all the conversations there was nothing said or done to set Anglicans and Nonconformists farther apart ; nay, we who shared in these conversations were drawn very near to one another in Christian fellowship. May I here pay my grateful tribute to the consideration, courtesy and graciousness of the attitude of all the Anglican representatives to the Nonconformist ? These hours spent at Lambeth will remain with me as a fragrant memory of Christian brotherliness. The response of the Free Churches has, I trust, been such as not to prevent further approaches when the way is again opened up in God's providence.

(2) The second discouragement many may find in the Lausanne Conference, which has been described as a *fiasco* and a *futility*. As one who was in the very core of that experience, I should not dare to describe in such terms a conference in which to sensitive souls the Spirit of God was so manifestly present ; there was a close fellowship in worship, in which never before in the history of the Church have so many

different Christian communions participated. I confess that it was to me a heartfelt disappointment that the Christians who could pray and praise, meditate on, and hear the Word of God together, could not join at the one Table as the guests of the one Master of the feast. But I recognize, as many of my American and British brethren cannot, that the common celebration of the Eucharist must be the consummation and cannot be the commencement of the movement for reunion. The Catholic and the Protestant conceptions of Church, ministry, and sacraments must be harmonized before the obstacle which the Catholic conviction asserts, and the Protestant often ignores, to inter-communion can be removed. It is the tragedy of the Church that these differences, rooted in the past, and not to be easily removed, culminate at the ordinance in which God's sacrifice for man's salvation is set forth. Here there must be mutual consideration, patience with delays, endurance of disappointments, and dependence on the guidance of God's Spirit into the way of unity. The spirit of the Conference disappointed fears and exceeded hopes.

What was accomplished did not fall short of what was intended, when the Conference was projected. It was never intended to initiate any negotiations for reunion, nor even to discuss the terms of reunion ; if that had been set out as the purpose many communions would have refused to participate. It was intended to explore, in a conciliatory and not controversial spirit, differences that hold apart no less than agreements that draw together. The Reports set forth frankly differences and agreements without any attempt to minimize the one and to magnify the other ;

the spirit of controversy was avoided, and the spirit of conciliation secured. The fellowship in worship and the partnership in study of the problems involved remains unbroken ; no communion has withdrawn, and all communions desired to be represented on the Continuation Committee. The difficulty which emerged at the end regarding the last report has been dealt with by a Committee, largely guided by the wise counsel of the Bishop of Gloucester. When we recall the results, and still more the temper, of some of the œcumenical councils of the Church in previous centuries, we may gratefully recognize that even on such disputed matters as faith and order Christians are learning, not only to tolerate, but even to understand and respect, their differing convictions. If only the spirit of Lausanne could be diffused among all the churches of the world, the historical divisions would become less prominent, and the essential unity in Christ be made more manifest.

(3) The third discouragement, which it would be cowardice to ignore, has recently been felt, and very keenly, by some to whom Lausanne has meant a great deal. I am as unwavering as any of my brethren in my Evangelical-Protestant-Nonconformist convictions, and have just as little liking for some of the changes proposed in the Revised Prayer Book, but I have consistently held that the Church of England should have been left free to settle this matter for itself, unless it attempted to alter the fundamental conditions of its very existence as an Established Church ; that Nonconformists, as citizens, should have been content to gain the assurance that the proposals did not involve such a revolutionary change ; and

that in consistency with their convictions regarding the sole authority of Christ in the Church, "the crown rights of the Redeemer," to use a phrase dear to my dissenting Scottish ancestors, they should have refrained from invoking the action of Parliament to settle such a question. But most of my Nonconformist brethren, who could not even understand my attitude, were no less conscientious in their conviction that, as the question had been submitted to Parliament, it was their duty as citizens to do what they could to prevent what they believed to be a threat to Protestantism and a lapse towards Catholicism. As a section of Churchmen held that conviction also, and even invited the assistance of Nonconformists in their campaign against the Measure, it cannot be described as a quarrel between Churchmen and Nonconformists which would justify any withdrawal from the more friendly relations which now happily obtain.

In face of the world's urgent need of Christ, and the Church's imperative duty so to show and offer Christ to the world that His truth and grace will be experienced, and in view of the fact that the divisions in the Church do make the presentation of Christ to the world less effective, no such discouragements which the movement towards unity has encountered or may encounter would, in my judgment, justify any of us in allowing any drifting apart again of those who were being drawn together. As there is one God, one Christ, and one Spirit, so there is only one Church, of which the churches in their divisions are imperfect evidence to the world, but of which in their unity alone they can become a progressive manifestation, being by His Spirit perfected in oneness.

WESLEYAN METHODISM AND THE ANGLICAN CHURCH

BY THE REV PROFESSOR W. F. LOFTHOUSE, D.D.,
PRINCIPAL OF HANDSWORTH WESLEYAN COLLEGE

IF, in responding to the generous invitation of the President of this Congress, I am to address you to any purpose, I must begin by recalling to my own mind, and to yours, the wide and daring visions of Lausanne. I know that the great conviction burnt into the hearts of us who were present there, "God wills unity," finds its welcome in this great assembly. But I know too how differently at Lausanne, and perhaps at Jerusalem, and I suppose here also, that conviction was and is felt to demand its appropriate expression. Some were impatient at the obstacles in the way of a speedy *rapprochement* of the sundered communities; others feared lest those eager steps should lead us to press beyond the mark into the uncharted regions of "Pan-Protestantism." Some, when they looked at the future, saw it projected on the crowded screen of the involved and complicated history of the past; to others the screen was little more than a *tabula rasa*. Hence, to some, inter-communion was the final step to be taken, inconceivable till we had travelled far from the maze where we find ourselves at present; to others it was the

first step, the pledge of goodwill and fellowship in Christ, without which any travelling together would be wellnigh impossible.

Now, you have not asked me to come here to expound or criticize either of these views ; my task is simply to explain, as far as my own knowledge will allow, the attitude of the majority of Wesleyan Methodists to them. In a rapid sketch, the colours may be crude and the outline too sharply drawn ; but I would beg you to remember, in all I say, that it is traditional with Wesleyan Methodists to think of the Church of England as the Church of their origin, and to recognize in John Wesley, whom they will always revere as their beloved founder, a loyal son of the communion which he thought he understood better than her own Bishops.

Methodists have always refused to call themselves Dissenters ; yet they feel themselves at ease with Free Churchmen, and freely accept the name for themselves. They are at home in Free Church sanctuaries ; their type of public worship is similar, though they use a liturgy almost like yours for their sacraments. They can meet other Free Churchmen at the Lord's Table. This is not to say that it is frequently done ; but there is no prohibition or difficulty, and where there is any desire, as at inter-denominational gatherings, it is quite natural. Each Church will welcome ministers of the others to join in administration.

Hence, they feel a real difficulty in the question, " Why cannot we join in the same way in the Eucharist with the Anglicans ? " This is increased rather than lessened by the great words of the Lambeth appeal :

“ We acknowledge all those who believe on our Lord Jesus Christ, and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity, as sharing with us membership in the universal Church of Christ.” When the Wesleyan is refused, he is perplexed and hurt. For this refusal, he feels, implies some vital difference between the Communion in an Anglican church and a Methodist chapel: he is being told, he thinks, that his ministers cannot do for him what the Anglican clergy do for their flock. This he cannot believe, partly because of his deep respect for his own ministers, partly because of the fellowship of his own Church, partly because of his own experiences, but also because he knows that all grace comes from Christ (here we all surely agree), and that while the channel may assist the stream to flow, no human channel is necessary for that living water. He cannot believe in the inadequacy of his own ministry, because to him no ministerial adequacy is necessary. Free Churchmen may look at their ministers in different ways, but on this point they are at one, and Wesleyans with the rest.

Thus, when the Wesleyan thinks of the journey towards union, it is a journey on which men travel side by side. They must set out from some common starting-point, or they will never meet. This must be their common relationship to Christ their Saviour. “ We all partake the joy of one ”—the words are Charles Wesley’s—“ the common peace we feel.” He no longer thinks—if he ever did think—that those who are outside the pale of Methodism are on a lower plane. Doubtful as he may have been whether some of the ministers of other communions

have been really called of the Spirit, he would never unchurch their flocks. But if members of different communions are to become in any sense one with each other, they must recognize as already existing the oneness of each other with Christ. In the actual negotiations for union of which the Wesleyan has had recent experience, with the other Methodist Churches, that was not for a moment called in question. This is why intercommunion seems to him to be the first step. Many Anglicans, I suppose, would reply, "Granted that we all start from Christ, you have given up things that we hold important, and this divergence has broken our unity, and must keep us apart." But the Wesleyan would question this. The divergence exists, he would admit ; but can it affect the underlying unity in Christ ? To be one thing with Christ, as Christ is one thing with the Father—I refer to the great words in John xvii.—does this not spring from believing in Christ, abiding in Him, and keeping His commandments ? And is this possible, or not, outside an episcopal communion ? Intercommunion is thus, to him, at once the symbol of unity and the instrument of reunion. The true and just antecedent of intercommunion is not an administrative readjustment of orders or credentials, but the spiritual unity which consists in an agreement as to the message of the Gospel, and devotion to the gracious purpose of its centre and Lord, in the midst of a perishing world which is calling out for the one voice and the one proclamation of the Kingdom of God.

This, however, the Wesleyan will be told, is a question of orders. Bishops, it will be said—I quote

from the report of Section V of Lausanne—"who have received their office by succession from the Apostles are the necessary ministers of ordination, and the Apostolic Succession so understood is necessary for . . . the validity of the sacraments." If the position is stated in such terms as these, he will certainly find a difficulty in accepting it. And, if a personal reminiscence may be pardoned, I can well remember my own surprise when, after my experiences as a boy in a broad church parish, the doctrine was expounded to me by a fellow-undergraduate at Oxford, who afterwards became Frank Bishop of Zanzibar.

Speaking frankly, if the acceptance of this doctrine is a necessary preliminary to union, the prospect is hopeless. How can he believe, as these words seem to him to bid him believe, that he has not been baptized and has actually never communicated? But, if he has, why this stress on orders? Surely, he will say, to quote the report once more, "no particular form of ministry is necessary to be received as matter of faith."

But here he will be reminded that there are other views of ordination, besides that which I have just referred to, in the Anglican community itself. He will not be unmindful of the high authority of Bishop Lightfoot. And he will ask, in the words of the Lausanne report, whether the Apostolical Succession, as described above, is "a vital element of episcopacy." Or is the historic Episcopate itself essential to the validity of the sacraments? Can we find the assured grace of Christ (apart from the uncertain ground of uncovenanted mercies) only in one or other of three

definite communions, Roman, Orthodox, and Anglican, with perhaps the addition of the Swedish Lutherans? And would it be a subversion of all Church order if the sacraments were administered by laymen, that is, by persons outside the Churches possessing the historic Episcopate?

On this point the Wesleyan would hold to the position of John Wesley himself. Devoted as Wesley was to the practice of frequent communion, both for himself and (when they could find someone to give it them) for his followers, he yet could affirm "I am a scriptural episcopus as much as any man in Europe; for the uninterrupted succession I know to be a fable which no man ever did or can prove." Wesley, he is often reminded, lived and died a Churchman; and if it was consistent with good Churchmanship in Wesley to hold the Apostolical Succession a figment, to glory in the name of Protestant, to disobey episcopal commands when they clashed with his own judgment, to organize lay preaching on a large scale, to hold services in technically unconsecrated buildings and administer the sacraments to unconfirmed persons, and himself to set apart men for the work of the ministry, the Wesleyan believes that he may be allowed to claim the title of good Churchman for himself.

But Wesleyans, it will be said, themselves possess an ordained ministry. The work of preaching, indeed, is very far from being confined to the ministers; but Wesleyans do restrict the administration of the sacraments to ordained ministers, or, more precisely, to persons who are authorized by the Conference to administer them. In the recent negotiations for

union with the other Methodist Churches, a wide disinclination for any relaxation of this rule was evident. The rule, however, arose from a solicitude for the sacraments rather than for the ministers. With our constant dependence on local preachers, we feel that there might be a real danger to the due conduct of the rite if the rule were neglected, even though this means that many, shut out of course from their parish churches, must for long periods go without. In principle, however, very few would attach any other importance to ministerial administration. Believing in the "sacramental" in its wider sense, they would hold that wherever a little company of Christian men and women were met in the name of Jesus, the humblest believer might utter the words "take, eat," and make of the symbols the means of eucharistic grace. Most Wesleyans are but little instructed in the nicer shades of sacramental doctrine; but for most of those who do come regularly to the Table, a few simple hymns (Charles Wesley's and Bickersteth's among the rest), and the splendid and comprehensive reticence of the Anglican liturgy, which says so much about the welcome to the penitent sinner, the receiving of the Lord's body and blood, the reasonable and living sacrifice of the worshipper, and so little about the sacerdotal function of the celebrant, shape and mould their thoughts into a deep and ardent piety.

Yet Wesleyans have their own ordination service, and it is a very solemn one. In all but a few cases, seven years must elapse between the day when a man is accepted for training as a candidate for the ministry and his ordination. Then come

the words "take thou authority to preach the word of God and to administer the holy Sacraments in the congregation." As is well known, Wesley ordained preachers to serve and to ordain others in America, when the colonies were left without sacraments or ecclesiastical organization after the War of Independence. Also for Scotland, and then for England. Immediately after his death, the annual Conference resolved that there should be no ordinations without the formal consent of the Conference itself—a rule which has been universally kept from that day to this; and from 1793, preachers were received into full connexion with the Conference and to administer the sacraments, though without imposition of hands. Proposals for the imposition of hands were made in 1822, but it was not granted till 1836. Thus, just when the Oxford Movement began, Wesleyan Methodism felt that it had all that was of real value in what Keble and Newman and Pusey set out to give to the Church of England.

But, whatever might be thought about the importance of imposition, the development of the administration and government of the Wesleyan societies went on. In the Methodist Episcopal churches of America, the Bishops, as they are called, have certain powers, under the Conference, which an English diocesan would never dream of claiming. Wesleyan Methodism is geographically more compact, and while it gives great influence to its "chairmen of districts," it has always vested the final authority in the annual Conference. The representative Conference, composed of both ministers and laymen, directs the whole policy of the Church, at home and

on the Foreign Field, and supervises all financial arrangements; the Pastoral Session, composed of ministers alone, controls ordination and, when necessary, expulsion, and is finally responsible for the appointment and work of every one of the ministers. When Conference has come to a decision, therefore, "*Roma locuta est, causa finita est*"; and for the last seventy years, if any minister has felt that he could not agree with one of its decisions, he has quietly withdrawn. On the other hand, I think I am right in saying that the area of doctrinal divergence is smaller in Wesleyan Methodism than in either the Anglican Church or in any of the leading Free Churches. We have no sympathy with "any form of reduced Christianity."

Enough has been already said to show how important the question of the sacraments is felt to be. Wesley himself believed in very frequent communion, and was ridiculed for it as a young graduate in Oxford; though he did not believe in the necessity of fasting communion—possibly this fact is not without its significance for the attitude of the stricter Churchmen in the eighteenth century. The Communion is not now administered as frequently as by Wesley: but here I would add that, like Wesley, Wesleyan Methodism has no place for the belief in any grace superior to what is obtainable elsewhere. For all the deep reverence which most Wesleyans feel for that rite, they would never, by such a phrase as "the Lord's own service," relegate to a less important place the regular worship of praise and prayer and the preaching of the Word. They are at one with other Free Churchmen in regarding preaching itself as, in the wider sense

of the term, a sacramental act. Accustomed to lay emphasis where they find it most frequently laid in the New Testament, they fix their thoughts on the free grace of God, pardoning and sanctifying, received through faith, accompanied always by a change of heart and life, and, normally, by the witness of the Spirit, giving the believer an assurance of his acceptance into the family of God. With regard to the relation of the sacraments to all this, they would follow some of the leading Reformation divines in being more anxious to say what the sacraments do not effect than in defining what they do. But I know of no sympathy among Wesleyans with the doctrine or practice of Reservation. Rightly or wrongly, they regard Reservation as at the least a distinct advance towards Rome ; and they are as devoted to what they, with all Free Churchmen, revere as Protestantism as was that ardent Churchman, John Wesley himself. The Wesleyan Conference took no official step in the recent debates on the Prayer Book ; several Wesleyan Members of Parliament voted for the new book in the House of Commons ; but I should not be doing what you ask me to do if I did not say that there was a very general feeling of relief at the two votes in Parliament.

I have dwelt upon these points because I believe that the most pressing necessity now is not academic discussion on Church orders (however indispensable that discussion must be), but a careful review of actual convictions and practice in the Churches. I have, therefore, recalled the steps by which Wesley's followers developed his own practice, and in loyalty to

his own clear and often expressed convictions have found themselves drawn to a sympathy with the Free Churches which is far closer than anything they can feel for certain sections of the Anglican Church to-day. But Wesleyan Methodism is itself, in a real sense, a "bridge Church": not indeed between Catholicism and Protestantism, but between the Anglican Church and the Free Churches. It is true that Methodists would not easily accustom themselves to diocesan episcopacy as it exists in this country. That guarantee of order and unity and orthodoxy for which the episcopal churches look to their Bishops, the Methodist Church, as it is firmly convinced, has gained by a system which is in nowise out of harmony with Scriptural references to Bishops and other Church officers. But while Wesleyans would distrust any form of episcopal authority, they have none of that fear of prelacy which is still so deeply felt in many Continental Churches and in some Free Church quarters here; they have no memories of 1663; their histories say no more of Laud than they do of Judge Jeffreys. And if Methodists have not forgotten the pulpits closed to John Wesley, and the misrepresentations and persecutions (*sit venia verbo*) endured by many of his followers, they still thank God for the saintly lives of Fletcher, Perronet, Grimshaw, and many another Anglican clergyman, and they look with a regard which is something far more than sentimental to the Rectory at Epworth.

We delight to take and use your gifts, your scholarship, your hymns, the venerable tradition of your devotion and piety, the august worship of your

cathedrals and ancient parish churches ; we would gladly, if you would allow us, kneel at the Lord's Table in your sanctuaries. But we believe that we also have our contribution to make, from stores which we already to some extent share with the other Free Churches : the unwearied and indispensable services of our lay preachers, the fellowship and pastoral oversight embodied in the various forms of what we call our society class-meetings, our conception of the unity of the Church made possible by our connexional organization, our standards of liberality in the support of our varied religious activities, and the care which we have always exercised over the selection, the training, and the conduct of our ministers. We regret and deplore the worldliness and coldness within our own ranks. We know but too well how this, strengthened by all the forces that make for irreligion outside, weakens the traditional Methodist passion for the evangelization of the masses of the people. We look forward to our forthcoming reunion with the two other larger Methodist Churches ; we hope for a new inspiration therefrom to the service that we owe to Christ, the Lord and Redeemer of the world. The practical problems raised by this movement, it must be confessed, go far to drain our attention from the contemplation of a larger union yet to be ; but we recall with gratitude the avowal of the Lambeth appeal, and we welcome such words as those of one of your own honoured theologians, " a rich diversity befits the universal Church, but intercommunion is in principle vital to Catholicity," and of the distinguished President of this assembly " it is sufficient to establish at present that, so far

as I can see, no particular theory of the Church and no form of Church government can find any support, direct or indirect, in the teaching of our Lord." We are convinced—on this point there must be no misgiving—that, however desirable union may be, nothing must come between the Saviour and the "weakest believer that hangs upon Him," and that neither priest nor prophet can do more than point the distressed and the sinful to the Redeemer who brings the wanderer back into the Father's house. And if it should still be your wish not to receive us to share in your Eucharist, nor to give full recognition to the ministers of the Word and sacraments among us, we shall still welcome opportunities for co-operation (happily increasing steadily in number) in the service of our common Lord. And since He who has given us the one faith and the one baptism has set before us a task which divided forces and recurring suspicions will always cheat of success, we believe that He will once more join all who are being saved, in apostolic teaching and fellowship, in the breaking of bread, and in prayer.

CHURCH UNION IN SOUTH INDIA

BY THE REV. G. E. PHILLIPS, M.A., FOREIGN SECRETARY
FOR INDIA OF THE LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY

IT is never easy to see why conditions favourable to Christian unity should flourish in one country rather than in another, and antecedently no one would have supposed that South India was the specially appropriate scene for momentous experiments in this connection. Yet as a simple record of fact, those of us who have worked there have found that in that country we were thrown together, and consequently developed fellowship, with members of other branches of the Christian Church, more than in any other part of the world. Since the early years of this century this spirit of unity has found expression in union movements of many kinds, but those which chiefly interest us just now are (*a*) the organic union in 1904 throughout India of churches connected with various Presbyterian missionary societies, under the title of "The Presbyterian Church in India": (*b*) the similar union of Congregational Churches in the South which followed in 1905; and (*c*) more important, the fusing of these two, in 1908, into one organism, known as the South India United Church, with a constitution believed to combine the essential elements both of Congregationalism and of

Presbyterianism. All who have been members of this Church since its inception feel that its twenty years of life bear manifest tokens of the divine blessing upon this effort towards unity.

Shortly after the War, as the result of a widespread desire, particularly by Indian ministers and clergy, that the whole Church in India might become alike more Indian and more united, an informal Conference of ministers of the Anglican Church and of the South India United Church was held at Tranquebar, and issued a public statement that it believed union to be the will of God, making some preliminary suggestions about uniting its own two branches of the Church Catholic. The presentation of this statement to the respective controlling bodies resulted in the formation of a Joint Committee of representatives of the Anglican and South India United Churches, which for several years has been preparing proposals, and these from time to time have been referred to the appropriate Church bodies for their views. More recently these negotiations have received added importance from the fact that the Wesleyan Provincial Synod of South India decided to participate in them. This means that apart from the Roman Catholics, the Syrians, and the Lutherans, most of the Christians in South India, numbering between six and seven hundred thousand, are represented in these discussions. The discussions themselves take place with complete freedom and frankness, and of course cannot commit a Church to the acceptance of any proposals before it has given them the full consideration which its constitution requires. A meeting last June of the Joint Committee has put forward suggestions which accord-

ing to the belief of many well-qualified persons, are likely to result in the near future in the framing of definite proposals for the organic union of these three bodies. On the Anglican side it is hoped that such proposals may take definite shape in time for the next Lambeth Conference to be asked to express an opinion upon them.

So much by way of the barest historical introduction. What must be added is that these prolonged negotiations have been maintained under a sense of compulsion from above. We have not felt at liberty to drop them when we were inclined so to do because we had come up against difficulties which seemed insuperable. Again and again it has happened that some have come to a meeting of the Joint Committee with the definite intention of suggesting that the discussions be abandoned, because views conscientiously held on either side were too divergent to be reconciled without sacrifice of principle. But when we arrived at the meeting-place we found that that course would be disobedience to a heavenly vision, and we had to go on.

May I at once clear the ground of one possible misunderstanding. These proposals do not represent an attempt at compromise for the sake of unity, between certain branches of the Christian Church. They are not a kind of religious arbitration, arrived at by persuading each side to give up something it desired to retain, and to include something which it disliked. They are not an effort to obtain some "Greatest Common Denominator" in religion. They are not even closely parallel to the discussions on reunion in Britain and elsewhere. They represent a com-

bined effort in research to ascertain the will of God for His Church in India as it faces the future in these early days. The first paragraph of the first statement by the Joint Committee, reaffirmed ever since, contains these words :—

“ Our only desire is so to organize the Church in India, that it shall give the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought and the life of the Church universal.”

It is an Indian Church which is under contemplation. The point is not what you as an Anglican and I as a Free Churchman can agree about ; we are neither of us decisive factors in this problem. When our Indian Christian brethren, who have not our history behind them, profoundly desiring to be their own Indian selves in their approach to God, and profoundly desiring to be free of hampering divisions which to them have little meaning, call together the representatives of separate branches of the Church to find by united prayer and deliberation God's way for His one Church in their land ; and when they courteously invite the participation of us whose ecclesiastical roots are in Britain, it is clear that a bigger matter is in hand than an arrangement between Anglicans and Free Churchmen.

This is not a distinction mainly theoretical ; it most practically affects one's attitude to the negotiations. For instance, in the proposals under consideration, I may be tempted to weigh up the sacrifices which one side or the other is making, and to condemn the proposals if these are not evenly balanced. When I as a Free Churchman find that I am being asked not only to accept episcopacy, but to accept what look

like limitations of that spiritual freedom which to me has been the breath of life, the natural man in me asks whether from the Anglican side sacrifices equally great are being demanded. And when the natural man has his doubts on that matter, he begins to say that this is unfair and to set himself against the proposals. But that whole discussion about fairness and the balancing of concessions is irrelevant and out of order. What is the way by which the Church of Christ in India can become the Indian expression of the spirit, the thought, and the life of the Church Universal? Our task is combined research, not haggling between bargaining parties. The bargaining may never be settled. But since there *is* the Will of God for His Church and the promise that it shall be made known to faithful seekers, the combined research must ultimately have its results.

Now for the proposals themselves. There is nothing more difficult than to summarize statements made with care and accuracy on great subjects like this, but the risk must be taken to save time. I only ask that no one will condemn the proposals on the basis of my summary, but await their publication in full, which presumably will soon take place.

In the "*Statement of General Principles*" there are introductory paragraphs which are pretty much what you would expect on the fundamental matters of the Holy Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and the two Sacraments. The statement on the Episcopate is as follows :

"That believing that the historic Episcopate in a constitutional form is the method of Church Government which is more likely than any other to promote and preserve the

organic unity of the Church, we accept it as a basis of union without raising other questions about episcopacy."

The meaning of the phrase "historic and constitutional Episcopate" is further elucidated as follows :

"That the bishops shall be elected. In the election both the diocese concerned and the province shall have an effective voice ;

"That the bishops shall perform their duties constitutionally in accordance with such customs of the Church as shall be defined in a written constitution ;

"That continuity with the historic episcopate be effectively maintained, it being understood that no particular interpretation of the fact of the historic episcopate be demanded."

As to ordination, it is agreed :

"That after union all future ordinations to the presbyterate (ministry) would be performed by laying on of hands of the bishops and presbyters (ministers).

"That all consecrations of bishops would be performed by bishops, not less than three taking part in each consecration."

In this connection the Joint Committee suggests an attempt to symbolize the perpetuation in the reunited Church of the ministerial traditions held in separation.

N.B.—It is suggested that in the inauguration of the union, at the first service of consecration of bishops, the laying on of hands shall be successively by groups of ministers severally representing the S.I.U.C. and the Wesleyan Church, as well as by Anglican bishops, thus conserving for the United Church the traditions held by each of the uniting bodies.

The autonomy of the Church after union is postulated by the statement :

“That the Church in India ought to be independent of the State.

“That the Church in India must be free from any control, legal or otherwise, of any Church or Society outside of India.

“That while the Church in India is free from such control, it would regulate its acts by the necessity of maintaining fellowship with other branches of the Catholic Church with which we are now in Communion.”

One of the most serious obstacles in union discussions has always been the problem of the status of the Ministry of the uniting Churches, and this has received much attention. The June statement is as follows :

“That the Joint Committee unanimously recommends that in order to secure the full mutual recognition of the ministries of the uniting Churches, the existing ministers of the three Churches be accepted as ministers of the Word and of the Sacraments in the Church after union, with the distinct understanding that no minister ordained before the union shall minister temporarily in any church or congregation without the consent of the parish minister and the congregation, or shall be transferred to any new congregation without the consent of the congregation and the bishop.”

On the related subject of inter-communion and inter-celebration this is what is put forward :

“The great object of complete spiritual unity within the Church will never be obtained till all members are willing and wishful to receive communion equally in every church, but the attainment of this object will only be retarded if authorities or majorities in the United Church make arrangements which have the effect of forcing those who have conscientious objections to receiving communion from ministers not episcopally ordained, to do so or else to forego communion. It is therefore agreed that :

(a) Arrangements existing at the time of union by which Anglicans in any particular place enjoyed opportunities

of receiving communion at the hands of an episcopally ordained minister will not be terminated after union against their will by the Church authorities, and

(b) Any congregation accustomed to an episcopally ordained ministry will not either temporarily or permanently be placed in charge of a non-episcopally ordained minister unless all the communicant members of the congregation have been informed of the suggested appointment and no one has signified his objection to such an arrangement."

It is quite clear that the union aimed at is to comprehend wide differences, to make no effort after uniformity, and to maintain a scrupulous regard for the conscience of the brother who differs. The system will be difficult to work, but is right in principle, and probably will work far better than any attempt at uniformity of practice.

Granted that the existing ministers of the uniting Churches are all fully recognized, what of the ministry of the future? The following passage in the Joint Committee's Report is likely to receive much attention :—

"It is the intention and expectation of those who enter into this union that eventually every minister exercising a permanent ministry in the Church will be an episcopally ordained minister.

"It is agreed that for the thirty years succeeding the union, the ministers of any Church whose Missions have founded the originally separate parts of the United Church may be received as ministers of the United Church, if they are willing to make the same declarations with regard to the Faith and Constitution of the United Church as are required from persons about to be ordained or employed for the first time in the United Church.

"After this period of thirty years, the Church will consider and decide the question of such exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry."

The difference between this and the proposals previously formulated is that then the interim period during which ministers from the founding Churches in the home lands might be received was longer, viz. fifty years, but at the close of that period it was intended that no one should minister in the Church unless he had received regular episcopal ordination. Now the transition period is shortened to thirty years, but it is left to the Indian Church thirty years hence to decide the question of exceptions to the general principle of an episcopally ordained ministry.

This does not mean that our friends in South India have conveniently shelved an awkward question. It means that it is clearly realized that the united Church must deal with this matter for itself, but it cannot deal with it adequately now, it must have a generation's experience before it can know, exactly what is involved in any decision taken. I think this proposal expresses more truly than previous proposals our reliance upon the Spirit of God guiding His Church in India.

As to the relations of the United Church as a whole with other Churches, it will seek to maintain fellowship with all those branches of the Christian Church with which the uniting bodies at present severally enjoy such fellowship. If its bishops are invited to the Lambeth Conference they will whenever possible accept the invitation. At the same time the United Church will seek affiliation with the World Presbyterian Alliance, the World Union of Congregational Churches, and the Œcumenical Methodist Conference. Its position in this respect will be not unlike that of the Church of Sweden, which is at present in com-

munion alike with the Episcopal Churches, and with the non-episcopal Lutheran Churches in Germany. Such a position might prove of great value in the future promotion of even wider measures of union.

On the general subject of Inter-Communion, it is expressly laid down that the united Church must make its own decisions, subject to which the following is stated :

“ It is the intention of the uniting Churches that during the early period of union, during which all or most of its ministers and members will be persons who have previously belonged to the uniting Churches as separate bodies, none of such ministers or members shall forego any rights with regard to inter-communion and inter-celebration which they possessed before the union. It is equally the intention of the uniting Churches that none of their ministers and members shall be required to do anything in these matters to which they may have conscientious objections. They are assured that the United Church will in these matters avoid on the one hand any encouragement of licence or condonation of breaches of Church comity and fellowship, and on the other hand any un-Christian rigidity in its regulations or in their application ; and that in all its actions it will seek the preservation of unity within, the attainment of wider union, and the avoidance of immediate contests on particular cases.

“ Within the United Church itself, it follows directly from the fact of union, that any communicant member of the united Church shall be at liberty to receive communion in any of the churches of the United Church.”

There is a section on the use of Creeds, and one which lays down the constituent elements which should be indispensable in every Communion Service in the United Church. It is a significant and encouraging fact that agreement was at once obtained upon what are the principal constituent parts of the

Communion Service. Several other important topics are receiving further study.

I have stated the proposals as baldly and objectively as I could. May I now make brief observations upon them ?

(a) If they are adopted, there will be strange oddities here and there. I can imagine some congregation which emphasizes a connection between proper episcopal ordination and validity of the Communion, stirred by severe searchings of heart when it finds itself in the diocese of a bishop who until recently was a Wesleyan Methodist minister. Just as easily I can imagine certain Indian pastors on my own side of the fence who have far outdone their missionary teachers in the principles of Independency, greatly bewildered at finding themselves part of a diocesan organization under a former Anglican bishop. There will be confusion at first, but surely this matters little. We are taking first steps along a road whose future stretches lie hidden from us. Life is too complex for us to be able to proceed with everything neatly arranged and tidied up at every step. If our principles are sound, in other words, if this union is of God, we shall find the way through each difficulty as it presents itself.

(b) It cannot be too strongly urged that the ultimate decision of these grave matters should rest with the Church of Christ in India. We of the older Churches have no right to settle such matters as these for that younger Church. At the Jerusalem meeting of the International Missionary Council principles were laid down which have received general approval, governing the relation between the younger and the older Churches. Perhaps the first definite test of

whether our approval of those principles is sincere will come in connection with these proposals. We from the home lands and from the Missionary Societies must not only announce that we desire the Churches to exercise this freedom, but we must scrupulously avoid taking action at this end which will have the practical effect of limiting the freedom which we verbally accord.

If this principle is heartily accepted, then it will be possible for the Churches in Britain to give advice, which undoubtedly will be sought, without fear of the semblance of dictation. We cannot give such advice unless the proposals have been seriously considered amongst ourselves, and it is with a view to ensuring a fair discussion in the home country that I have stated them to you now. The giving of Christian counsel on so momentous a subject as this will be felt by all Church bodies in Britain which are consulted, to lay upon them a heavy weight of responsibility.

(c) The acceptance of these proposals will not prove an easy matter for any of the bodies concerned. I am not the appropriate person to outline the difficulties which will be felt from the Anglican side, though I think I can see some of them fairly clearly. From other sides there will be great practical difficulties as well as difficulties with regard to principles of Church government. Supposing that thirty years hence the United Church should decide that in future it will not recognize even the temporary ministrations of anyone who is not episcopally ordained, my own Missionary Society will be faced with the fact that those of its supporters who are ministers in Britain, should they visit in India the Churches which their

own labours have helped to bring into existence, will find themselves treated as laymen. The indirect effect of such a situation upon the home income of the London Missionary Society can easily be imagined, and with the best will in the world the Society might find itself unable through lack of funds to continue its subsidies to Church Councils at anything like previous rates. It would be foolish to shut our eyes to the fact that we are taking great risks. But whatever the risks, the Directors of the London Missionary Society will feel themselves compelled to adhere to the fundamental principle adopted in 1795, which is that "The design of the Society is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church Order and Government, but the glorious Gospel of the Blessed God, and it shall be left to the minds of the persons whom God may call into the fellowship of His Son, to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the Word of God." In general terms the Directors have already informed the Church Councils with which the Society has connection that it expects them in this grave matter to follow in freedom the guidance of God's Spirit. It has warned them of possible financial difficulties which may arise, but urged them to follow the divine leading even at the cost, if necessary, of diminished support from Britain.

Finally, whatever may be our view of these or any other particular plans or methods of Church reunion, I believe that our attitude towards the whole matter depends more directly than we suppose upon our faith in the living God and in the forces of His King-

dom which are released when men have faith. Ordinarily we seem committed by the past to certain lines of action which have led us apart, and it seems impossible to imagine that at this late hour in history some new and better way could emerge. We feel the same difficulty as we face the issues in international affairs raised by the Kellogg Pact, and while we hope for the best, secretly admit that the bad old warring world still exists, human nature is unchanged, and we had better be prepared for the worst. Can we take risks in the belief that God can bring forth new things in nations and in Churches, the belief that, in the sense given to the words by our Lord, the Kingdom of God is at hand ? Maybe He has some plan for His Church in India different from those upon which the edifice of Christendom in Europe has been erected. It is not for us, while professing to seek humbly a knowledge of God's way and will, to look backward to our failures in the West, and draw narrow boundary lines around what God can accomplish in the East. Rather we will welcome with trembling hope the thought that difficulties which long have baffled us here may be overcome there, and in this as in all else, we will rest our souls on Him who is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.

RELATIONS WITH OTHER COMMUNIONS, AND REUNION IN THE MISSION FIELD

BY CANON GARFIELD H. WILLIAMS, SECRETARY OF
THE MISSIONARY COUNCIL OF THE CHURCH ASSEMBLY

REUNION *seems* more urgent in the mission field than it does at home. I am beginning to doubt whether it is very much more urgent in the one place than in the other. Overseas we are usually considering the problems of a small minority of Christians surrounded by a solid mass of paganism. But is that very different from the position of those in this country who are striving to live “in Christ Jesus” in the midst of a secular civilization? Overseas in our mission schools and colleges Christian pupils are often a minority—in India, for instance, often a little group of Christian students of different denominations among a mass of Hindus. But is that in its essentials very different from the position of the comparatively small group of boys and girls who come from godly homes of differing denominational allegiance and who live their lives in our schools and colleges surrounded, I suppose, often by a majority of those who come from homes where God is little revered. Overseas more and more the native Christians are travelling far afield, and when they

leave home the chances are that in the place to which they go there will be no place of worship or little group of the same communion as that in which they have been brought up. This situation is certainly more in evidence in the mission field than it is at home, but it is a very likely contingency in the great dispersion of our race scattered all over the globe. We, however, are not the only race dispersed over the world. Here is an example of how disunion affects a Chinese dispersion, and I could multiply examples almost indefinitely. In Borneo the Chinese immigrants are almost all Hakka-speaking, but no Anglican mission is at work in the Hakka-speaking districts of China, and thus no Hakka-speaking priest can be called from China to work among them in the Diocese of Labuan and Sarawak. Often in our mission fields overseas it will be inevitable that the native Christians will marry outside the communion in which they have been brought up and that, too, is not an unlikely contingency here at home or in our great dispersion overseas. Every one of these factors mentioned above, and multitudes of others I have had no time to mention, suggest very *practical* reasons for reunion ; but not one of them or all of them put together compare in importance, as reasons for bringing our divisions to an end, with the simple fact of *the weakening of our witness* as a divided church. What warrant have we in Scripture or in the experience of the ages for believing that the world can be won for Christ in any other way than by an exhibition of love in action ? At present there is not a non-Christian country in the world that does not jibe at us “ see how these Christians *hate* one another.”

You say it is not true, we do not *hate* one another. All I can say is that if I were a Moslem or a Hindu or a Confucian or a Buddhist and heard that the Christians refused to eat together at their Lord's Table in the sacramental meal, I should be certain either that they were caste-ridden or that they had feuds. I do not think there would be any other alternative to the Eastern mind. In any case, their refusal thus to have their sacramental meal together could by no stretch of imagination actively suggest that they loved one another. But is it very different here at home? As those that are without have listened to our Prayer Book controversy, do we imagine that they have refrained from the same jibe "see how these Christians *hate* one another," and as they see rival places of worship, competing services, refusals to feed together at the sacramental meal, and so on, do we imagine that they are impressed by the love that Christians exhibit towards one another? How often we bewail our empty churches. But what right have we to expect them to be filled? Why does not the Christianity of to-day attract? Why should it? By the scandal of our divisions at home as well as abroad its witness is ruined at its most vital point—its expression of love in action.

But of course disunion does hit us harder overseas. At present most native churches rely a great deal upon the communions at home from which they receive their missionaries and from which they get financial support. While this continues they are naturally loyal to the Western Christian groups with which they are thus connected. But this loyalty is to a supporting body rather than to a communion,

and as native churches get stronger and rely on missions less, the old allegiance to the missionary society and the Western communion tends to die, for it has little basis in reasoned conviction, nor any great tradition behind it, and in any case it is far more often a loyalty to persons rather than ideas. Chinese Christianity does not think of Robert Morrison as a Congregationalist, nor does Indian Christianity think of Carey as a Baptist, and what label do we imagine the African Christian of to-day is going to give to Livingstone and to Mackay?—incidentally what label do we give them! The fact is that our Western ecclesiastical divisions lack meaning for the native Christian, and when he ceases to need the support of Western missions his allegiance will tend to pass to that of an interdenominational national church rather than to an overseas section of one of the Western churches, and that indeed is what is happening in China to-day and in Persia. The danger is great that the native Christians' allegiance will be national rather than catholic, and, as Professor Heinrich Frick of the University of Giessen writing in the *International Review of Missions* has recently said—"the general task of missions is not to naturalize Christianity but to Christianize nature; *not to nationalize the Church, but to set the stamp of Christianity on the nations.*" At present we are, by our divisions, hindering these new national churches from being catholic, and if a National Church of China or India or Persia is founded which is out of communion with the Church of England it will probably be our fault, not theirs.

But our divisions are doing other grievous harm

overseas. Different communions working in different geographical areas in the mission field tend themselves to produce a separatism of another and a most dangerous kind which results in tribal or caste churches rather than national churches, and compared with which our sectarianism in the West is a lesser evil. The division starts by being denominational, it ends by being social; and when you have many tribes as in Africa and many castes as in India, the danger is fearfully accentuated. In my view the danger is very grave indeed, and I believe the Church is only saved from almost irreparable disaster by the violently rapid growth of a wider nationalism. There is real hope now that to be of the Bantu race is, for instance, going to be a bigger thing than to be a member of some one tribe among hundreds of other Bantu tribes, and to be an Indian a bigger thing than to be a Bengali. "Divide and Rule" is an utterly hopeless maxim, at any rate if you are thinking of the rule of Christ. The only *safe* thing in Africa and the East to-day is a united Church. We, with our divided Christianity, are only being saved from disaster by the growing unities that self-conscious national aspiration creates among the peoples of Africa and the East.

But one could go on, any missionary could go on setting this Congress to solve problem after problem, each of which arose solely from the scandal of our divisions. It cannot be right that this state of things should continue. And we are all glad to think that in South India at any rate a magnificent attempt is being made to win through to reunion.

I had intended to make a somewhat lengthy state-

ment concerning this matter, but after what we have heard from Mr. Phillips any further statement is entirely unnecessary. To the best of my knowledge he has represented to you with complete accuracy the situation in South India. As you have heard, the Joint Committee out there is meeting again in March, 1929. At that meeting it is hoped that it will be possible to produce a well-proportioned statement of cardinal points of agreement on which union might be based. May God grant this accomplishment.

This effort in South India merits your very earnest consideration and prayer. More depends upon its success than I like to think. The future usefulness of the Anglican Communion far more depends upon the result of these conversations that have now been going on for nearly ten years in South India than it does upon the matters that have been chiefly taking up our time and thought in the Church at home during the same years. Personally, I believe that the whole future of the Anglican Communion depends more than anything else upon whether or not we make definite advance towards reunion during the next two or three years. And that leads me to express a few entirely personal, tentative, and quite general thoughts on this whole problem of reunion; it being understood that in the expression of these views I speak for no one but myself:—

That our Lord expected that His followers would differ from one another and would tend to form separate camps seems to me to be obvious. Whether the intercession for unity in “the high priestly prayer” contains his *ipsissima verba* or not it certainly has the authentic voice. Belief in His expect-

tation of disunion and in His demand for unity is not however based on a few proof texts. It is a necessary inference from almost any reading of the Gospel narrative. And every New Testament writer touches in some way or other on the same theme. We are dealing here with one of the fundamental problems of religion, and we must face the fact that the more vital and important the issues the more certainly will the better minds and the stronger characters differ concerning them. If His disciples had found nothing in Jesus Christ to differ about, His religion would not have outlived its first century of activity. I can never make out why people who so definitely and conscientiously differ amongst themselves to-day are at such pains to try and prove that all the New Testament writers agreed amongst themselves about Christ and His Church. Of course they did not agree. His followers disagreed amongst themselves during His lifetime, and they continued to do so after His death and resurrection. Within about twenty years of His Ascension they were holding a council at Jerusalem in order to compose their differences, and they started the never-ending task of discovering credal formulæ the very moment the Church began to expand, and His followers are still continuing the task to-day. People do not worry to produce written creeds because they all agree, but just because they do not agree. Creeds are feelers after unity, and the great creeds of the Church are superb hypotheses upon which to build up further research into the divine immensities of Jesus ; " witnesses to " and " safeguards " of a faith which is " proclaimed " in Holy Scripture, but which must ever in the last

analysis be unfathomable, comparable to the scientists' superb hypotheses concerning the laws of nature. Every now and then a Newton or an Einstein, a Luther or a Calvin, an Augustine or an Aquinas, a Kant or a Hegel, turns up and they make "reality" bigger even than the immense thing it was before they came, and by so much they make our creeds and laws of nature *too small*. *They rarely, if ever, do more than make them too small*. The death-bed utterance of ancient creeds is always "amplius." It seems possible we have got to a point now where we had better leave the creeds alone, that seems to me to be the message of Lausanne, not because they are adequate—they are not—but because we all now know that the thing we are trying to express is too big for any form of words—certainly for any final form of words. Hence incidentally the great wisdom of the Bishop of Gloucester's formula concerning the creeds at Lausanne, where his contribution was something for which the whole Church stands indebted.

I believe disunion on the vast issues of religion to have been inevitable. It seems to me our Lord indicated that it was inevitable. Any Christian philosophy of History really demands its inevitability. God cannot in His creative activity permit freedom and exclude sin, and He cannot permit freedom and exclude disunion. Freedom of thought among growing personalities absolutely presupposed disunion, but just as in the purposes of God we are to use our freedom to conquer sin, so in His purposes we are to use our freedom to conquer disunion. St. Paul was quite clear about this. Not only had there to be the will to victory over what we usually think of as sin,

there had to be the will to victory over disunion. The will to victory was as necessary in the one case as in the other.

I submit that these two ideals form the very kernel of Christianity : victory over sin, and victory over disunion in the formation of a real fellowship ; and that these two ideals are visibly set forth in the most amazing way in that incident in the Upper Room on the night of our Lord's betrayal, and that on that account if for no other reason it was inevitable that that incident should be pivotal in the subsequent development of organized worship in the Church.

Of course it is here that the real tragedy of the present situation appears. It seems to me to be a perfectly natural inference that the sacrament of the Holy Communion was instituted quite definitely (though of course not solely) as the chief method by which the Church was to be helped to translate its will to unity into effective action. If you doubt this inference take a spell as a missionary (in India for preference) and you will doubt it no longer. Intercommunion is the obvious remedy for caste churches, for racialism and tribal antagonism and for class consciousness within the Church, and it must have acted in precisely this way in the early Church.

I submit further that where the will to unity is developed in the Church to-day experiments in intercommunion are inevitable, and here I am treading on extremely delicate ground and I desire particularly that if what I say is reported or quoted the whole of what I say on this subject and not sentences out of their context may be so reported or quoted. Please do not think that it is just the " hot heads " who will

make these experiments. It seems to me that it will be difficult to make any really dispassionate study of the facts of disunion without feeling the need of actual experiment in the realm of intercommunion. It is rather the passionate party man who is the "hot head" in this matter and is opposed to all such experiment. It seems to me that no one who thinks about the matter in a quiet matter-of-fact way can escape the conviction that experiments in intercommunion are necessary. I do not say that intercommunion is the means rather than the goal of reunion. What I do say is that we have got to find out whether it is or not, and to what extent it is and is not, and that means experimentation; and that a real will to unity on the part of the Church of England will involve on her part such experimentation. In this scientific age many of us, and we are by no means all of one school of thought, are simply not prepared to accept anybody's merely oracular statement that intercommunion *must be* the goal *and not* the method of reunion. We want proof and we have not as yet got that proof. And the more the party men on both sides get "hot headed" and shout about this and hurl their anathemas, the more we feel the necessity of a little cold dispassionate experiment.

Of course we do not want mere haphazard experimentation. That is almost always futile and almost always harmful. We want experimentation in the Church of England in the realm of intercommunion as careful and as honest and unbiased as experimentation in the Cavendish Laboratory at Cambridge in the realm of physics. It is not only in the

“quantitative ” sciences that you can have honest and unbiased experimentation. We believe that such experiments can be devised and that they are long overdue, and that their results *may* (we do not say more than that) be far-reaching. Moreover, we are convinced that when we have in the Church of England gained a real will to unity, such experiments will inevitably be made. Authority, even if it wishes to, will not be able to stop them any more than authority could, at an earlier period of Church History, stop experimentation in the realm of natural science.

When the Oxford Movement and its successors forced the Church of England to think more fully and more deeply about the Sacraments they were building better than they knew. For whether their doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist or that of their opponents or neither the one nor the other is correct, one thing is certain, and that is that whatever view you take of it, it is certainly “the Brotherhood Meal,” and no man who takes account of facts to-day can really believe that membership in that Brotherhood is rigidly confined to the membership of any one (or even all for that matter) of the so-called “Churches.”

CONGRESS SERMONS

CHRISTIANITY IN MODERN CHRISTENDOM

EPHESIANS v. 15-17.

SERMON PREACHED TO THE CHURCH CONGRESS AT
CHELTENHAM ON TUESDAY, 2ND OCTOBER, 1928.

BY THE RT. REV. HERBERT HENSLEY HENSON, D.D.,
LORD BISHOP OF DURHAM

“Look therefore carefully how ye walk, not as unwise, but as wise; redeeming the time, because the days are evil. Wherefore be ye not foolish, but understand what the will of the Lord is.”—Ephesians v. 15-17.

IN a brilliant sketch published three years ago in Paris, and excellently rendered into English last year under the title *Christianity and the French Revolution*, an eminent historian, M. Aulard, discusses the reasons why the attempt made by the Revolutionary leaders to abolish Christianity in France provoked such slight resistance, and came so near to succeeding. At one time, he tells us, he had held that “Christianity was indestructibly rooted in the soul of the French,” but a deeper study of the evidence had changed his opinion :

“Since then, having read more documents, and now having perhaps a clearer insight into the facts as a whole, I am startled at the ease with which the people of France in 1794 began to drop their customary worship.

“The peril thus run by Christianity at the time of the Worship of Reason and the Worship of the Supreme Being is the most outstanding episode in the religious history of the French Revolution.”

The peasantry, he holds, had never been effectively Christian. The working-class population of the large towns was filled with anti-Christian prejudice. “The middle classes were largely imbued with natural religion of the Voltairean or Rousseau brand—especially the latter.” The ex-nobles “were quite ready to be infidels.” He sums up :

“Patriotism, philosophy and the indifference of the rural masses—these were the causes which gave pause to Christianity. Would they have been finally successful if violence and destruction had continued? *One thing is certain, that at the said period the greater part of the French nation had managed to do without religion, the habit of centuries had been broken, and if the historian had bent however keen an ear, no general groan, no great popular wail of grief and anguish, would have been audible to him.*

“If the victories which saved France, which reduced to impotence alike the foreign foe and the anti-revolutionaries whose accomplices the priests seemed to be—if these victories had been long delayed, if patriotism had been the stay of philosophy for a longer period, if there had been any reason for the continuance of violence, who can say that such a course of events might not have proved fatal to Christianity in France?” (*v. l.c.*, 121 f.)

If the disaster had come about, M. Aulard thinks that “the peasant, who was at that time quite illiterate, would no doubt have relapsed for a while into his old pre-Christian habits, to the practices of magic and witchcraft, which were absorbed by Christianity.” The superfine “Religion of Humanity,” about which the fashionable philosophers had waxed so eloquent, had no attraction for him.

Within the last few years Russia has repeated the experience of France, and the question which was suggested to the historian in the most advanced Christian community of Europe more than a century ago is suggested again in the most backward Christian community of Europe at the present time. Why have the Bolsheviks been able with so little difficulty to disestablish and disendow the mighty Church of Russia, and to embark on a violent and sustained attack, with all the resources of a despotic Government, to destroy the Christian Religion? Perhaps the language in which M. Aulard explains the French problem would explain also the Russian. It is interesting to note that the reversion to primitive paganism which he thought probable in eighteenth-century France is actually taking place in twentieth-century Russia. I quote from Fülöp-Miller's illuminating and well-documented volume, *The Mind and Face of Bolshevism* :

"An extraordinary picture of the chaotic conditions which the anti-religious propaganda has produced may be found in the reports of the Commission which, under the chairmanship of Professor Bogaras Tan, was charged with a sort of ethnographical investigation of outlying districts. These reports show that in localities only a few versts apart, and even in the same places, part of the population celebrates 'red Easters' and holds mockery processions under the direction of anti-religious agitators, while a number of others not only take part simultaneously in the orthodox ceremonies, but even worship magicians or profess a very primitive phallic cult. In the Kazan Government, at the very time when the Communists were making reports on the astounding progress of the atheistic propaganda, the whole Kheremiss tribe officially renounced Christianity and returned to the old pagan faith. The same thing happened in the Belovzevsk district : there, too, part of the population is organized

on atheistic lines, while the other part has gone over in a body from the orthodox Church to paganism. In many districts pagan sacrificial feasts have been revived: oxen and rams are slaughtered and the flesh is cooked in special cauldrons and eaten with peculiar rites. Sometimes it even happens that the peasants find a compromise between the contradictory opinions by holding a joint festival to celebrate the pagan gods of old, the saints of the orthodox Church, and the new heroes of Communism." (v. l.c., 218.)

There is, beyond all reasonable question, a vast difference between the situation here in England in 1928, and the situation in France in 1789. There is, perhaps, an even vaster difference between England and Russia at the present time, because over and above all questions of history, culture, and polity, there is the profound and subtle distinction between the European and the Asiatic. Nevertheless, the parallel is sufficiently close to compel the question—What reason is there for feeling confident that the Christianity of England in 1928 is more firmly fixed in national acceptance than was that of France and of Russia on the eve of their respective revolutions? We are not so far distant as to repudiate all interest in their fortunes:

jam Deiphobi dedit ampla ruinam
Volcano superante domus; jam proximus ardet
Ucalegon.

(v. Aeneid, ii, 310–12.)

At least the most optimistic among us must admit that the conditions, which preceded the revolt against Christianity in France and in Russia, are certainly present in England. Here also the peasants are indifferent, the urban masses disaffected, the middle classes sentimentally agnostic, the *intelligentsia* largely

anti-Christian, and the owners of wealth self-indulgent and materialistic. If we may claim, and I think we may, that there is nothing in modern England which matches the prodigious practical abuses in Church and State which marked the situation both in France and in Russia, we may not safely forget that much that seems incredibly shocking to a free and educated democracy such as that which now exists in England, did not offend the public conscience either in France under the Bourbon kings or in Russia under the Romanoff czars. And there is another circumstance which merits far more attention than it commonly receives. Public exasperation has its roots, not so much in actual suffering as in imaginative resentment. Lord Bryce, in the illuminating and most melancholy book, *Modern Democracies* (which might almost be described as his confession of political faith), comments on the apparent and familiar paradox that social disadvantage should be most bitterly resented by a generation which does not itself suffer from the ancient wrongs, and is actively engaged in removing actual grievances. He applies the prophetic proverb : *The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge,*" and makes this comment :

"Injustice always brings punishment in its train, but *the spirit of revenge often grows with time, and is stronger in the descendants of those who have suffered than it was in the sufferers themselves* ; while the penalties fall not on those who did the wrong, but on their more innocent successors who are trying to atone for the past. The wretchedness of the toiling masses in some industrial countries from 1780 till far down in the nineteenth century left a legacy of bitterness which became actively conscious in their grandchildren, even as the oppressions borne by the peasantry

and workers of France before 1780 gave birth to the passions that found vent in the ferocities of 1792." (v. ii, 637.)

A considerable literature, written with great knowledge and sometimes reaching a high level of literary merit, describes the former oppressions of the English poor, and the intolerable miseries of their lot, providing from the inexhaustible mine of the Past fuel for the baleful fires of envy and discontent which are ever burning in civilized society. Contrasts of wealth and poverty, of self-indulgent luxury and the cruel privations of want, of the pleasant activities of the leisured, and the abhorred idleness of the unemployed—these are reproduced, exaggerated, and proclaimed by the cinemas, the popular press, and the illustrated society journals. A new bitterness enters into the inequalities of fortune.

Where Plenty smiles, alas! she smiles for few,
And those who taste not, yet behold her store,
Are as the slaves that dig the golden ore,
The wealth around them makes them doubly poor.
v. CRABBE, "The Village."

The economic dislocation caused by the War, and nowhere felt with greater severity than in my own Durham, has undoubtedly bred in the minds of our industrial population a despondent and angry repugnance to the social conditions under which they live, and which bear so hardly upon them. Thousands of young workmen are looking with eyes full of hostile questioning on the national institutions, among which the Christian Churches, uttering a Gospel of fraternal equality in Christ, hold a position at once alluring and enigmatic. In these circumstances I am quite unable to echo the comfortable assurances which are

commonly audible in religious gatherings. May it not be the case now as when Jeremiah made his Cassandra-protest against his smooth-speaking contemporaries, that the less palatable interpretation of "*the signs of the times*" is likely to be the truest? "*Then said I, Ah, Lord God! behold, the prophets say unto them, Ye shall not see the sword, neither shall ye have famine: but I will give you assured peace in this place. Then the Lord said unto me, The prophets prophesy lies in My name: I sent them not.*" (chap. xiv. verses 13, 14.)

However the existing situation may be viewed, one feature of it is equally incontestable and disquieting, I mean the general and increasing ignorance of Christian faith and morals which marks our population. The decay of traditional religious observance—Lord's Day observance, Family Prayer, Bible reading, Church attendance and the like—which has attracted so much attention within recent years, implies the withdrawal from individual lives of the normal securities for instruction and discipline. As a nation we appear to be living on an inherited capital of Christian morality which is steadily wasting. A new Nonconformity has come into existence, no longer revolting against a specific ecclesiastical doctrine or polity but repudiating organized Christianity itself and objecting to all formulation of belief. The notion of a Churchless and Creedless Christianity now seems to commend itself to large numbers of English folk, and the more readily since it fits in conveniently with the habit of a society which is growing daily more mobile and less conventional. There is indeed no lack of public interest in quasi-

religious discussions and in ecclesiastical functions. We are, I suspect, in considerable danger of being deluded both as to the actual significance and as to the moral worth of this apparent interest. The organization of ecclesiastical functions has now become a fine art. Commemorations of historical persons and events are eagerly utilized, and sometimes financially successful. Advertisement on a great scale and the new facilities of movement draw together to impressive pageants in famous scenes vast crowds of interested visitors. A sympathetic press can be counted on to interpret flatteringly the achievements of sanctified business. There are indeed those who affect to believe that there is some counterbalance to be found in the religious use of Wireless. But the broadcasting of services and sermons can hardly replace the regular worship and instruction of the parish churches, though it may assist Christian people to forget the gravity of abandoning their religious habits. Where in all this can be found any effective teaching of Christian Faith and Morals? The most that can be hoped for is the diffusion of Christian sentiment and the popularization of Christian phraseology. If, then, it be the case that the normal course of English life is being rapidly secularized, everything would seem to depend on the equipment of Christian principles with which English folk start their lives. How far has their education in the elementary and secondary schools, in the public schools and universities, secured for them such a grounding in fundamental Christian morality as will secure them against the demoralizing pressures of social life? The moral worth of our national education depends, wholly in

some places, mostly in all, on the personal influence of the teachers, hardly at all on the provision for effective religious teaching included in the school curricula. That personal influence may be, in many cases certainly is, of priceless value. Great multitudes of English children have no other source from which to learn what Christianity means. To my thinking, a close alliance between the Church of England and the Teaching Profession throughout the country is an object of paramount importance, to secure which the surrender of such privileged position in elementary schools as the Dual System implies would be a small price to pay. Be that as it may, my present purpose is to fasten your attention on the great danger we are in by reason of the lack of adequate grounding in Christian Faith and Morals which now obtains in all classes, and to urge on you the solemn obligation of so rectifying our religious perspective as to ensure that our principal concern be directed to the remedy of this menacing evil, and withdrawn from those relatively petty matters which now embarrass and divide us. "*The times are evil.*" We cannot afford to ignore or misinterpret their "*signs.*"

"Things and actions are what they are," wrote Bishop Butler in his grimly simple way, "their consequences will be what they will be. Why therefore should we desire to be deceived?"

The record of Revolutions suggests that the two points at which the attack on Christianity is soonest made and most fiercely pressed are Sex-morality and Education. The two pillars on which Sex-morality in Christendom has rested hitherto have been the conception of the Marriage Union as permanent by

Divine Law, and the existence and claim of the Child as the normal product of the Marriage Union. Both these pillars have been removed by the licentious theories which are now accepted in Europe. There is no Divine Law, only a shifting social convention. The birth of children may be deliberately excluded. Hence the chaos into which sexual morality is falling throughout the sphere of Western Civilization. To disintegrate the home by facilitating divorce, and to desecrate the mind by de-Christianizing the school, are seen clearly to be the most effective methods of breaking the tradition of Christianity. Can any deny that both these baleful objectives are pursued within the sphere of English politics? It follows that the Church of Christ must give primary place in its scheme of duty to the cardinal and endangered interests of sexual morality and the treatment of childhood.

The method of ecclesiastical action must match the circumstances in which the Church is actually living. Society as a whole is now exempt from direct ecclesiastical control: but it remains amenable to Christian influence, and responds to the appeal of Christian service. We cannot reasonably hope to impose the discipline of Christ on a nation in which the great majority of the citizens stands outside the profession of Christianity. Of the parliamentary electors it seems certain that not more than one in seven is a parochial elector, and not more than one in ten a communicant in the Church of England. The full consequences of this extreme numerical weakness are only now beginning to be disclosed as the popular will uses the democratic polity in order to express itself in political action and social practice.

No doubt the Christian Tradition will die slowly in English public life. It will linger long as the brilliant after-glow of sunset, which fades by imperceptible gradations into the night, but die it surely must at last if it be cut off from the faith and worship which are its springs. The Church of England cannot any longer rest on conventions, albeit deeply entrenched in popular acceptance, sacrosanct by antiquity, and freighted with memories, which yet are empty of any core of reality.

Our immediate duty has been made quite clear by the course of recent events. We have to vindicate and make apparent to the world our character as a Church. The late Dr. Figgis said of Bishop Creighton that he "saw earlier than most people that the real question at issue was not whether the Church of England had done this or that in the past, not even whether it had the right to do this and that, but *whether there was a Church of England at all.*" That appears to me the question which has been proposed to us as English Churchmen, and we cannot avoid the duty of answering it. Upon our fulfilment of that duty much turns for the people of England. For, ultimately, the influence for good which the Church of England can exercise within the nation will be determined by the quality of its own churchmanship, the standard of morality which it can enforce on its own members, and the purity of the witness which it can render to Christ's Gospel.

CONGRESS SERMON

BY THE RT. REV. CHARLES GORE, D.D.

Preached at All Saints', Cheltenham

“ Let not him that eateth set at naught him that eateth not ; and let not him that eateth not judge him that eateth : for God hath received him. Who art thou that judgest the servant of another ? To his own lord he standeth or falleth. One man esteemeth one day above another ; another esteemeth every day alike. Let each man be fully assured in his own mind.”—ROMANS xiv. 3-5.

“ Though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any Gospel other than that we preached unto you, let him be anathema.”—GALATIANS i. 8.

“ We command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly and not after the tradition.”—2 THESSALONIANS iii. 6.

I HAVE prefaced my sermon with these texts, in evidence that St. Paul's presentation of Christianity shows it as a corporate religion, admitting of independence and variety of opinion, but on the basis of an absolute obligation to agreement on fundamental matters alike of faith and discipline. It is an ideal of comprehension within the limits necessarily imposed by a divine revelation or word of God and the divine institution of the Church as the sphere of “ the grace

and truth which came by Jesus Christ." On this basis the Catholic Church came into existence and on this basis it has subsisted.

No reasonable question can be raised that it was upon this basis of comprehension within certain defined limits that the Church of England took its stand in the sixteenth or seventeenth centuries. Thus when it required the constant recitation of the Creeds in English in all its public services it asserted its intention to adhere steadfastly to the old summaries of the Catholic Faith ; and at the same time it reasserted the ancient safeguard against the accretion of dogmatic requirements by proclaiming that nothing could become part of the necessary Faith which could not legitimately appeal for confirmation to the Scriptures. Twice since 1662 the Church of England has slightly varied its dogmatic requirements : for in 1865 it reduced the stringency of its demand for assent to the XXXIX Articles, and in 1927-8 it allowed the modification of certain phrases in the Baptismal Service which betrayed an excessively Augustinian emphasis and had been a stumbling-block to many. It also interpreted by an explanatory clause the declaration of unfeigned faith in the Scriptures required of those to be ordained, and it ceased to require the public recitation of the *Quicunque Vult*, solely, I suppose, on account of the occurrence in that statement of what are called the "damnatory clauses," which seem to go quite beyond what we can know as to the final judgment of God on individual souls, whose responsibility only God can gauge. But it has maintained unimpaired its rule of faith, its positive insistence on the Creeds and

its appeal to the Scriptures as limiting the dogmatic requirements.

I

But we must be undiscerning indeed of the signs of the times if we do not recognize, not only in the world at large but in the Church, and even among the ministers of the Church, of a really revolutionary claim to reinterpret the meaning of the divinity of Christ in a sense quite different from that of the Creeds, and to reject or discredit the miracles—those especially which are recorded in the Creeds as wrought upon the person of Jesus—His birth of a Virgin and His corporal resurrection the third day from the dead. Now the only effective way to meet any intellectual movement is by frank and fearless criticism. Thus the only way to meet the movement is by the candid examination of its grounds. I believe the examination which has been long in progress has tended to justify the affirmations of the Church—that is to say that, though we must cease to regard the Scriptures as historically infallible in detail, yet we are entitled, and more than entitled, to regard them as giving us a true and truly inspired account of Jesus of Nazareth as He was born and lived and taught and died and rose again, and a true account of the faith in Him which the apostle proclaimed, and which formed the basis of “the tradition” of the Church.

Thus we have no reason to think that our ancient rule of faith is antiquated. In particular I would echo the careful conclusion recently drawn by Dr. Edwyn Bevan: “What I think critical researches into the Gospels have made clear is that, if it [that

is the traditional story of Jesus] is not true, we are forced to the conclusion that the Gospel account of the words and actions of Jesus so transfigures and falsifies the historical reality that any reconstruction of the real Jesus behind the documents will be too conjectural and arbitrary to make it worth while for men to go on calling themselves His followers."

But I am not now contending only for the legitimacy of the Church's Creed. In what I am now saying I know that some of the best and most serious among those who disbelieve it are with me—that is, that it is fundamentally demoralizing and destructive of the reputation of the Church for honesty that it should, without protest, allow even a few of its ministers to declare this disbelief in the articles of the Creed which they are officially pledged constantly to recite as expressing their personal faith—"I believe." I suppose that such men are very few. That they are personally honest is plain, because they proclaim what they do not believe. But they are not, as far as appears, disowned by the Church. Within the last twenty years the Church has indeed officially declared its steadfast adherence to the Creeds—as well to its statements of facts as to its statements of doctrine. But the expressions of disbelief on the part of ministers of the Church are still heard now and again, and the newspapers make the most of them.

Now, if a priest of the Church were to celebrate the Roman service of Benediction and persist in it, the public knows he would be (as it is called) "put under discipline." But as far as we know, these repudiators of the Creed go unvisited by official cen-

sure, and the world takes note of it. In the national life at large we should desire criticism to be free, even beyond what seem to us the limits of reason. But freedom of criticism has nothing to do with the right of a man to hold office in a society of which he repudiates some of the fundamental principles. For my part I could not endure to hold even the humblest office in a Church which should punish ritual irregularities and tolerate fundamental denials. And I really believe there is a thing called "British justice" which would make such a policy impossible. The least that we must ask is that, whenever such a repudiation of the faith which the Creed expresses is publicly made, the priest who makes it should be at least publicly disowned. The occasions of such repudiations are not, we may be thankful, sufficiently numerous to make such official action difficult.

II

But the Church is not a society of mere adherents of a Creed. It is a society divinely formed to live a corporate life and bear a corporate witness, which draws its motives from a Creed. As such a corporate and continuous body it has within it a divinely given authority over its members and (lest they abuse their office to the distressing of their flock) especially over its officers. In England the Church (to its infinite detriment) was content to allow its disciplinary power to be overshadowed and paralysed by the State. The idea of the spiritual independence of the Church was almost lost. The Tractarian, or, as it is called, Anglo-Catholic, movement brought about the recovery of the idea of the spiritual independence of

the Church and called upon the clergy to put into practice the full requirements or implications of the Prayer Book, as being not a perfect but a sufficient exhibition of the principles of the Catholic Church.

The clergy who did so were treated with conspicuous unfairness for half a century. Meanwhile the movement had become popular and, like other movements which have been treated with marked injustice and lack of sympathy, it has shown signs of rebelliousness and extravagance. But what is worse, some of its prominent representatives have shared with the group which I was referring to earlier, the guilt of treating their positively or solemnly contracted obligations with something like contempt. But this is surely to take the name of God in vain. Too many of our priests have taken advantage of a situation, in which *all* the provisions of the Prayer Book could not be observed with what the late Bishop Mackarness used to call "Chinese exactness," to play fast and loose with the solemn declaration that "in public prayer and administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said book prescribed and none other, except so far as shall be ordered by lawful authority." Some have even alleged the unsatisfactory manner in which our bishops are appointed, and, generally speaking, the Erastianism of our traditions, as a sufficient excuse for not yielding them what could rightly be called canonical obedience. I can understand that such defects might be held to be a reason for refusing to take the oath of obedience, though I cannot agree that they are so.

But it seems to be contrary to plain morality to take the oath, and at the same time to hold that the

obedience promised cannot under the circumstances be claimed by the particular official to whom it is taken. The extravagances of which I have been speaking are intelligible enough if we enter into the feelings of those responsible for them. But they are unjustifiable. They appear to me to have bred in the minds of the laity, in combination with the extravagances I spoke of earlier, a widespread distrust of the honesty of the clergy. They have surely put back for many years the advance of the Movement which they are representing. We can hope and pray that they will pass away, under the new situation which we hope to see developing itself, like a "dream when one awaketh." But meanwhile they represent the degeneration of liberty into licence.

III

But there is one more danger to which we need to be awake. It is that which at the moment appears most prominently in the Mission Field. The waste and peril of the divisions of Western Christendom are there most evident. It is quite as it should be that the Indian and Chinese Christians who have been converted under Evangelical or Protestant influences should be intolerant of these divisions. The Roman Catholic communities seem to them to belong to a different world, and they have no thought of reunion with them. Now (to their honour be it said) by far the larger part of the work done by our Communion in the Mission Field has been done by Evangelicals, and the young Churches which have arisen from their labours are eagerly seeking reunion with their Protestant brethren with very scant regard to

what must be called Catholic principles. The most striking instance of this movement towards Reunion is found at the present moment in South India. I cannot criticize in detail the proposals for the formation of the United South Indian Church, because I do not feel sure about some details of these proposals, and the negotiations are still incomplete. But there are certain points on which, though with much reluctance, I feel bound to insist.

The Anglican Church is based not on compromise but on inclusiveness. At the time of the Reformation it refused to regard Catholic and Protestant as incompatible terms. It held fast to the Catholic basis of Creeds and Sacraments and Order, while it welcomed the Protestant appeal to Scripture as the final court of reference in matters of doctrine ; and it welcomed also some other features of the Revolt, such as the repudiation of the Roman supremacy, the marriage of the clergy, the abandonment of obligatory confession, the communion in both kinds, and worship in the language of the people. Currents of opinion have deeply changed since the sixteenth century, but the main features of the Anglican situation have not changed. We are still determined to hold together the Catholic and the Evangelical points of view as both necessary elements in the Scriptural idea of the Body of Christ. But nothing is more essential to the Catholic idea of the Church than the maintenance, in fact, of the apostolic succession in the Ministry, and the consequent conditions for the valid administration of sacraments.

Now, God is not tied to His sacramental ordinances ; and it is something like blasphemy against

the Holy Spirit to deny His presence and activity where the fruit of the Spirit is evident and continuous. But when the question arises of reunion it must be, if we are to participate in it, by a return to the Catholic principle of order. That principle fairly stated seems to me to be rational, intelligible, and deeply grounded in Scripture and history. Its observance, in fact, is the condition of cohesion in the Anglican communion. Moreover, it would appear as if schism in our own communion could more easily occur in the Mission Field than at home, because in the Mission Field you have young Anglican churches all of one colour most sharply contrasted. If in one of them the essential equality of all ministers, however ordained, were proclaimed even for a limited period, or ministers who had never received episcopal ordination were admitted, even with the consent of the bishop, to celebrate at (hitherto) Anglican altars, or Confirmation treated as optional, and the principle of open communion accepted, it will be inevitably the beginning of schism, which would spread from outlying regions to the home centre.

It is easy to ridicule insistence on what may easily be represented as mechanical details. But in history great principles are often involved in controversies about a detail. St. Paul was a wise man and a spiritual man: but while he proclaimed that "circumcision is nothing and uncircumcision is nothing" he could say also in another connection, "If ye be circumcised Christ shall profit you nothing." A mechanical detail, that is to say, may involve an essential principle.

IV

I have not been preaching a Sermon, but calling attention to a peril of the moment which is surely grave. The Church of England is to be the subject of consideration at your Congress. It glories in its comprehensiveness and quite rightly. But comprehensiveness is meaningless in a society unless it is limited—limited by that which belongs to the essence of the society. The need of the moment is that the Church of England should make clear to the world and to its own members what it stands for and intends to stand for positively—what it is that it holds for truth—as something so sacred that no unpopularity could justify its abandonment. At the present moment the world which takes note of religious phenomena does not know what to make of us, and our own members are distracted sometimes almost to the point of despair. I had much rather have spoken to-day about the Mission of the Church in the world—especially about the moral and social witness to which it is so urgently called. But if the Church is to bear this witness and do its work effectively, it must make more evident what it stands for. There must be a restoration of rational authority. This is the substance of what I would say. But in the few minutes that remain I would add three reflections bearing on our personal spiritual lives, such as more properly belong to a sermon.

First, that we must never allow ourselves to become absorbed in any current controversy. The controversy of the years just past has been full of humiliating features. There has been displayed an abound-

ing ignorance of the deep intellectual changes which separate our age from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries : an abundance of reckless and one-sided statements and enthusiasms : an absence of justice and of sincerity : a strange ignoring of relative values : a horrible recrudescence of party spirit. In such a period of controversy we are apt to lose our sense of inward peace. But we must refuse to suffer this. We must not allow ourselves to be absorbed in the controversy. We must inwardly withdraw upon the foundations of religion. We must be able at all times to say to God, " O how plentiful is Thy goodness, which Thou hast laid up for them that fear Thee : and that Thou hast prepared for them that put their trust in Thee, even before the sons of men ! Thou shalt hide them privily by Thine own presence from the provoking of all men : Thou shalt keep them secretly in Thy tabernacle from the strife of tongues." If we have unhappily lost this deep inward peace, we must resolutely go into retreat till we have recovered it.

Secondly, we must be prepared for divine judgment upon the Church. The Bible, Old and New Testament alike, is full of the expectation of judgment alike upon Churches and upon states, and upon individuals. Present-day Christianity likes to leave all this terrible aspect of the dealings of God with man out of sight. It likes to be optimistic with an optimism quite different from that of the prophets or of the Lord. We have in our own day witnessed awful judgments falling upon the Churches of Russia and of Mexico. When I reflect upon the history of the Church of England—upon its long-continued and

almost unparalleled worldliness : upon its Erastian betrayal of its own spiritual liberties : upon its long-continued acquiescence in the intolerable wrongs of the poor and helpless : upon its abiding preference of policy to principle : I cannot but expect divine judgment, which may be as devastating as that which fell upon the ancient Church of Africa, though wholly different in character.

But the distinctive witness of the Church of Tertullian and Cyprian and Augustine did not die even through the extinction of the African Church, and we may be sure the distinctive witness of the Anglican spirit—what one may call a Catholicism which is rational, liberal and scriptural—will not die. More than that, the judgment of God upon the Church of England, whatever form it takes, like the judgment upon the French Church at the time of the French Revolution, may well be but the necessary prelude to a splendid recovery. Only for judgment we must be prepared, even while we pray that God may preserve us from what “we most righteously have deserved” and are deserving.

Finally we must, every one of us, cast out of our souls the sense of personal irresponsibility and indecision. There are many questions, such as some of those raised in recent controversy, about which we may rightly remain undecided, because there are no adequate grounds for a decision. But about the fundamental questions, such as the Godhead of our Lord, the reality of the miracles which attended his manifestation, the institution by our Lord of the Church, of the Sacraments and of the Ministry, the grounds are before us and, with due openness of mind,

we must make our decision, and take our own share of personal responsibility. There is a miserable cowardice which Dr. Hort so well described as “the easy acquiescence in suspense between belief and disbelief” which finds every opinion interesting, and waits for the time which never comes, when there shall be nothing to be said upon the other side. We have to make up our own minds in accordance with the weight of the evidence, deliberately, under the invocation of the Holy Spirit, Who alone can give the conviction of faith, and take our part in accordance with our conviction, boldly and frankly, without regard to the opinion of men, and freed from the illegitimate loyalties of party spirit by the legitimate loyalty to the Communion of the Saints and to the person of Our Lord.

CONGRESS SERMON

BY THE RT. REV. GUY WARMAN, D.D., LORD
BISHOP OF CHELMSFORD

Preached at Christ Church, Cheltenham

“Perfect love casteth out fear.”—1 JOHN iv. 18.

WE are most of us hesitant, perplexed, distracted, uncomfortable, these latter days. Opportunity abounds and we would embrace it, but our arm is palsied by problem and by controversy. For the Church of England the days of easy-going optimism, smug self-satisfaction, and superior self-complacency have passed, and it is good that it is so. But it is not good that fear should reign in their stead. What is true of us is true in most departments of human life, but that does not better the situation, for it is the Church's business to lead the world and not to conform to it. In every realm of life and thought and activity there is problem and there is controversy. For Christian, for Churchman, for citizen, the road of life is full of obstacles and rough places, and the goal sometimes seems so far off as to be unattainable. Fears and forebodings everywhere tend to dominate life and to hinder progress.

The situation is not novel; it is but the repetition of past history. The story of the world, of the

Church, of any nation can be told in terms of conflict. The Christian life is a battle ; the story of the Church, told as it is for us in the revelation of St. John, is a long-drawn struggle. In all human affairs, so at least some philosophers have taught us, it is the conflict of antitheses which leads to truth, a conflict of ideals which makes for progress. We find some comfort as we read history and discover that past conflicts are not always appalling dissipation of resources, nor past controversies always futile waste of time. The problem must be solved, the controversies must be settled, the conflict of ideals must be fought out before we can move on to our goal. The pilgrim company cannot march until the obstacles on the road be removed or surmounted.

We are all anxious to get on with our real work. The family of man, viewed nationally or universally, is almost everywhere passionately anxious to make the world safe for its welfare and its progress. The Church of Christ, of course, and at their best, every branch of it and every school of thought within its branches, longs to preach its Gospel, to bear its witness, and to extend its influence, until the world be stamped Christian. We are all of us getting impatient, and little wonder, at the distractions of unsettled controversies and unanswered questions. It may be true that controversy is a mark of life, and that the distractions from which we suffer are part of our contribution to progress, but we love them none the more for that. We can give reason for our dislike from history. The distraction of current controversy has always hindered achievement. Every page of history gives illustration of the fact. In the days of Constantine the

world might have been evangelized had the Church not been rent by bitter controversy ; or in the days of the Renaissance, had it not been for the struggle for temporal power. Will the preacher of fifty years hence find a new illustration in the story of to-day ? Will he be able to say : Had it not been for controversy about forms of worship, the Church of England might have made a full and splendid answer to the call of the world, and might have become in very deed the bridge Church to unity ?

What then ? With all the wealth of experience behind us, with all the teaching of history, what are we to do ? We cannot lightly banish controversies and problems, we must face the present situation and face it with patience and courage, but we must never allow ourselves to forget our ultimate purpose ; evangelization, edification, influence, witness, the winning of the individual to Christ, the building of the Christian character in the individual, the maintenance of the Christian ideal, and the submission of all human activities to the rule of Christ ; these are the permanent and vital objectives, and must never yield place in our thought or in our action. The real danger is such absorption in controversy as to involve forgetfulness of the main purpose, and that danger becomes all the more real if we allow ourselves to drift into hopelessness. Fear obscures our vision and then enfeebles our arm. Facts will never be fairly and victoriously faced if we be fearful, and facts must be faced. The levity which ignores them, and the obscurantism which fails to see them, are alike fatal diseases in a civilized nation and in a Christian Church. For the moment I am not so much con-

cerned with the character of the problems that confront us as with the spirit in which, with our eyes fixed on our great purpose, we set out to deal with them. Faith and courage and determination must take the place of fear and uneasiness and distress.

Think for a moment of an illustration of two, and first in the realm of science. It is sometimes said that the long-drawn battle between religion and science is over, that we have learnt to respect each other, to recognize the boundaries and limitations which belong to either, and to live at peace. I doubt if this is true generally—I would it were. At best it is an armistice, with a certain amount of sore feeling and suspicion on either side. God reveals Himself in nature, and the true scientist is a prophet of that revelation. If God as He is revealed to us in nature and God as we see Him in the face of Jesus Christ be one God—and for us Christians that is axiomatic—it is impossible to believe that science can either destroy or undermine or depreciate the true faith of the Gospel. Scientific theories may find no place for God, or for the content of the Christian creed, but science itself can only in the long run give attestation to both. How then can we be afraid? And yet no meeting of the British Association ever takes place but it is followed by expressions of fearfulness and suspicion and condemnation on the part of religion. I do not want to make much of letters in the Press—too often as ignorant as they are anonymous—or the lucubrations in pamphlet form of a pseudonymous fundamentalism, but making every allowance for the timidity that is bred of ignorance and misunderstanding, is it not a fact that a

timorous obscurantism has much too large a hold on our minds? Science is revealing, has revealed, to us more and more of the miraculous resources of nature, and is harnessing those resources to our use and to our advantage, a testimony to the wisdom and the goodness of God. It is teaching us that the reign of law is universal, and the exceptions to it are fewer than we dreamed; teaching which we should have expected if we really believed that God is a God of order. Science is helping us, for our convenience, to mechanize much of human life, but it is not true to say that the best science of to-day is content, or tends to be content, with materialistic and mechanistic views either of the world or of human life. When we have ceased to fear science and scientific enquiry, we shall find in it a leader and friend.

Or think again of the faith in relation to modern thought. A dear old friend of mine once, in a moment of despair, preached a sermon on the sin of thinking, and I suspect that some of us would like to do the same. But in this day such a sermon would go unheeded. We live in a generation which, especially the younger element in it, has little regard for ancient authority, which sits loose to old conventions of truth, and questions the value of old sanctions. Moreover, we have not only to face the careful thinking of careful men, we are not only compelled to listen to those who in this day wear the mantle that has been handed down to them by generations of philosophers from the time of Plato and Aristotle onwards, but we have to listen, especially in the realm of psychology and of morals, to loose thinking about men and things which is born, not of a passion

for truth, but of a desire to discover a philosophy of life which shall pander to the lower instincts and which will provide excuses for the evasion of all that is best in our social relationships. Many voices in the market place to-day make themselves heard. They will not be drowned by timidly crying that the creed is in danger. They will not be stilled by the stopping of our ears to the whole message of modern thinking. They will be met by the clear enunciation of truth, and for that we can welcome all that the best philosophy of this or any age can give us. The world's thinking is not the foe of the Christian creed, to be feared ; at its best it is the helper of the Kingdom. It may sometimes tend to lead us for a while by strange paths, paths which we cannot follow, but at long last it will help to truth.

Or once again in relation to modern social movements. I mean by social movements all those tendencies and efforts which make for the family life of the human race, whether international or national, political or economic, all the methods by which men in this age are trying to plan as conveniently and as comfortably as they can the effect of our dependence upon each other. In ostensible aspiration all these movements are making for the good of the whole race, or nearly all of them. Ideas of peace and prosperity, of service and of fellowship, appear in every programme. On the other hand, there is little question but that the solution of our political and economic problems is hindered by suspicion, mistrust and fearfulness. Much has been done to clear the air and to improve the atmosphere. In the international realm, the Pact of Paris is an example of this, and in indus-

trialism, the railway agreement and such conferences of employers and employed as have been suggested by Lord Melchett. But much remains to be done. The attitude of the Christian Church in all these matters has its difficulty. There was a time when, if you knew a man was a churchman, you knew to what school of political theory he adhered. That time, fortunately, is gone. Churchmen belong to every political party, even the least accepted and oddest political and economic theories find supporters in our ranks, and it is perhaps well that it should be so, for it tends to permit the exercise of Christian influence and to prevent undue suspicion and depreciation of the efforts of other people at the amelioration of our conditions of life. We still need a better spirit; we need clarity of aim; we need the eradication from our social life of all those lesser loyalties that are inconsistent with the common good. It is here that the Church has its opportunity, but it can only exercise it if it be unafraid of the domination of false methods and false theories in social life. We have been, and we are, too often obsessed by the fear of wrong and mischievous things. The fearless proclamation of Christian principles and the fearless application of them will bring an influence and an achievement that fear of wrong can never bring. The ill things in our common life, whether they be insani-tary dwellings and bad drains, or whether they be class war based on hate, or political selfishness, are things not to be feared, but to be fought. They must be fought fearlessly, but they must be fought lovingly. Care for the welfare of our fellow men is part of that love which casts out fear.

Not forgetting the fears that beset us in relation to science and thought and practical life, let us for a moment turn our eyes upon the Church itself. For the last few years two great enterprises have been much in our minds, the movement towards unity, of which Lambeth, 1920, Lausanne, 1927, and Jerusalem, 1928, are significant landmarks, and the effort to bring our common worship into line with the needs of the Church to-day, of which so happy a story cannot be told. What is the plain fact of the situation? We are succeeding, so far as we are succeeding, in the quest for unity because love has been the controlling principle of our efforts. We have failed over the matter of our common worship largely because suspicion and contempt and fear have played too great a part in their influence upon us. I am not concerned with the past except so far that I desire to learn its lesson. The task of the Church is ever in front of it. It cannot face that task in the spirit of fearfulness, and it need not. Its Bible can find friends in criticism and in science and in philosophy; its Sunday can regain its place, not, perhaps, its old place, but its right place, in our modern social life; its worship and its Sacraments will still meet the need of the men and women of this age, despite the temporary parenthesis in the appreciation of institutional religion. But so long as fears without and fightings within are characteristic of its life, it can never fulfil its duty to its Master and to the people of this land and of the world.

Pardon a few plain words about our present internal situation. We are divided, perhaps, not as sharply as we once were, into schools of thought. Each

school of thought at its best and rid of mere partisanship, feels, and rightly, that it can make its contribution to our common life. These natural divisions, however, all too easily breed dangerous tendencies amongst us, and unless those tendencies be cured, they must enfeeble the Church and, indeed, may rend it. Suspicion, contempt, fear, are things which ought to have no place between Christian brethren, members of the same branch of Christ's Church. We ought neither to experience these things ourselves, nor give ground for them in others. And yet it is to some extent a fact that the Evangelical suspects the Anglo-Catholic, that the Anglo-Catholic is contemptuous of the Evangelical, and that both fear the Modernist. We cannot help belonging to our respective schools of thought, for they mean very much to most of us. We can, if we have learnt the lesson of love, refrain from suspicion, contempt, and fear of others, and we can make it our business that in ourselves we do not tempt others to suspect, to despise, or to fear. Remember, if it be wrong to suspect, it is also wrong to deserve suspicion, and so also with contempt and fear.

I may be right, or I may be wrong, but it seems to me that at least to some extent what I presume psychologists would call the "fear complex" has settled down upon us. If I am right at all, it is having disastrous results, and we must find the remedy. It is written very shortly in my text, "Perfect love casteth out fear." Love complete in all its parts puts fear out of our reckoning. I suspect that the application of this remedy will be challenged. In relation to those complex problems that I have

chosen as illustrations, I shall be told that in the battle for truth and right sentiment must not interfere, and love, after all, is emotional, sentimental. Of course, there is reason in the objection, a sufficient amount of reason to have led us sometimes to attempt to solve the problems of life and of the Church in terms of what we call truth and right, and to forget, at least sometimes, that love has its part to play. To that reasoning I have three things to say.

First, we have abundant testimony on the other side in the extremely controversial life of the early Church. Experience taught the first disciples the lesson that I am trying to pass on. The writer of this epistle had lived long and had played no small part in the triumphs of the Church in the first century. He is the author of my text. It is recorded of him that in his extreme old age his one message to the Church that he loved was "Little children love one another." It may be only tradition, but it is a tradition entirely consonant with the whole tenor of the Johannine writings. Again in the pastoral epistles, full as they are of the records of controversies and of problems, we read a similar message, "God has not given us the spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and discipline." The fear complex is alien, not merely to New Testament teaching in theory, but to New Testament teaching after it had had the advantage of experience.

Secondly, the world is beginning to see the value of that which I have claimed as simple Christian teaching. In the past society has been organized too largely upon a basis of fear; the whole system of warfare is a concession to the fear complex, and now

the nations are conspiring to cast out that fear. The Pact of Paris is my text in treaty form. So, too, in industrial life. What else is the movement that Lord Melchett has inaugurated and that has been so largely accepted by capital and labour alike, but an effort to write across our industrial life the motto of my text? It would be pitiable indeed if the internal controversies of the Church became the only place where the unscriptural and unchristian complex of fear were allowed to dominate.

Thirdly, and this is the sum of the whole matter, the perfect and complete love of the text is in no sense merely sentimental or emotional. As a practical thing it is God in action and the God of love is also the God of truth and right. Speaking the truth in love, and indeed doing it, does not mean turning love into sentiment or truth into compromise. It may be a long and difficult road which will lead us to the place and the time when a synthesis between truth and love is accomplished, but the road must be trodden if the Church is to be loyal to its Lord. We search for truth in love and we search for love in truth. It means a new spirit, a spirit which we have been demanding as essential in every other department of human life and which we must recognize as essential in our own. It will be a costly business for all of us, it will mean the giving up of much, but that which is given is not worth retaining, prejudice, suspicion, contempt, self-will, and such like; it will mean patience, for love suffereth long; it will mean unselfish considerateness, for love seeketh not her own. It will bring its compensation; the spirit of fear has never solved problems, has never brought

us aught else but disappointment and disaster. Love is motive power. In love we search and learn, and the end of our quest is true science. In love we think and study, and find ourselves philosophers. In love we work and serve, and at long last will come that reorganization of society which is worth the having because based on love. It is love of God which brings the vision of truth in its train, it is love of man, which is touched with the unselfishness of Christ, and brings that unselfishness into common life, it is love of truth and right, which seeks first the Kingdom. Thus and thus only can all other things be added, all controversies settled, and all problems solved, for He giveth us not the spirit of fearfulness, but of power and of love and of discipline, and perfect love casteth out fear.

ANGLICANISM AND ANGLICANS

“I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus, that ye be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment.”—1 CORINTHIANS i. 10.

SERMON PREACHED BY THE MOST REV. THE LORD ARCH-
BISHOP OF DUBLIN IN GLOUCESTER CATHEDRAL

THE Anglican Communion has been the subject of our consideration during the Congress, and it would be difficult to do anything else than speak of it this evening.

It is a great privilege for one who is not officially connected with the Church of England (although I was born and baptized in this Diocese of Gloucester), to be allowed to speak to you this evening from the wider standpoint of membership in the Anglican Fellowship.

It is probable that we who live outside England are much more conscious of our membership in the Anglican Communion than are you who are members of the Church of England at home. It means much to us that we belong to our local Church whatever it may be, but it means almost as much to us, if not more, that our Church is set in the great Anglican Society. You who are placed here in a privileged historic position, are not pressed to look outside your

own borders, quite in the same way as are churches either possessed of no special privilege, or founded at no far-off date.

I do not say that it is good that the Church of England should be thus self-contained. I do not think that it can be good : I merely point to what I believe to be the fact.

Your position in England protects you, up to a certain point, from challenge ; but in other countries where Establishment either has ceased or has never been known, the Church of the Anglican tradition stands side by side with other religious bodies, all equal with it before the law, equal to it or even larger numerically.

Most of these other bodies are affiliated with denominational organizations of a world-wide character, their relations with which give them a significance much greater than their local importance might suggest.

And it is a like consideration that, in the case of the churches of the Anglican type, causes the Anglican Communion to mean so much to us. Locally we may be weak, but through our association we are strong. We do not stand for a few peculiar sectarian tenets of our own devising : we stand for a historically maintained position, which has enjoyed a wide and long consent. And thus the uneasiness we might feel in our isolation, is largely allayed by the invisible background of fellowship of which we are conscious.

There is a real advantage, for each of our scattered churches, in being able to point not merely to a central sister or mother church in England, but to a

number of sister churches in different parts of the world.

If the word "Anglican" stands for anything really final, it stands for something else than a synonym of the word "English." It stands for a theological position, held no doubt and consolidated by the Church of England in the first instance, but held by it primarily because of its objective virtue and reality, and not because of anything specially connected with the geographical entity known as England.

If such geographical, or national, limitation there were, the position would be rendered untenable for churches outside the British Isles or the British Empire, and untenable for many individuals even in England.

The Anglican churches would be unable to preach Christianity as they have come to understand it, as the Catholic religion embodied in national churches for peoples who are not necessarily British by race.

I suppose little serious difference of opinion exists on this point.

I am not aware of anything in our early Anglican writers to show that they thought of themselves as setting forth any special type of religion. They conceived of themselves as going back to the sources, i.e. "the rules of the Scriptures and the practice of the primitive Church" (Canon XXX), and presenting original Catholicism in its purest form to the English people. And accordingly, membership in the Anglican Communion does not involve approaching religion by way of anything typically English.

The Anglican Communion, no doubt, had its begin-

ning in England, under circumstances forming part of English history, and for a long time had its being hardly anywhere else than in the British Isles. And even when the Church of England gained a footing beyond the seas, Establishment always seems to have gone with it.

But the process of colonization and plantation, followed by the secession of the American colonies, and by the demand for freedom from connection with the State which arose in the Church of one dependency after another, all served to make Anglicans living out of England set about distinguishing between the English associations of Anglicanism and its objective characteristics.

And this process went forward with greater vigour according as churches outside England became increasingly conscious of their separate identity, and sought for a form of self-expression in worship and administration, that should correspond with their special needs.

It is one of the main witnesses to the validity of the Anglican position, that this process of disengagement has proved as simple as it has done, even if it has been tedious; and that the various national churches have found it possible to maintain conformity to the general Anglican type, and yet shake themselves entirely free of any of the local associations of the Church of England.

May not this be largely due to the circumstances attending the beginnings of what we know as Anglicanism?

There was no intention to create a polity; no desire

on the part of doctrinaires to round off a logical system for the Church of England. While on the Continent Church systems were elaborated, in England little more was done under Henry VIII than to vest in the Crown the general jurisdiction which had hitherto resided in the Papacy. And later on, when it was sought to replace Roman doctrine with Reformed, such was the deference paid to sound learning and to the desire to preserve continuity with the past, that the Anglican formularies were kept in close relation to ancient standards, and the tendency to reaction held severely in check.

It is safe to say that the Church of England was not consciously concerned with what nowadays we call Anglicanism at all.

What it sought to do was to retain everything that it was felt could reasonably and safely be retained, and not to be frightened away from the use of good things, just because there had been abuse of them.

It was only because, when the Church of England, obeying its practical instinct to trust the old rather than to experiment with the new, took its own way of teaching the Christian faith to the people of England,—it was only because under these circumstances a form of religion eventuated having a complexion of its own, that the existence of what received the name of Anglicanism came to be observed.

These characteristics were no doubt sharpened and intensified by isolation, geographical and ecclesiastical. But the Church of England never set out to be a *hortus inclusus* for the English people. From the beginning it regarded itself as simply the primitive

and apostolic Church of Christ, or rather as the local presence and organ of the universal Church in England and among the English elsewhere. Reformation meant the reassertion of original Catholicity; and only if the practice of asking the question, "Is this true to the standards of antiquity?"—only if the asking of that question is English, only then must we admit that Anglicanism is a thing essentially English.

We have then a group of churches to be found wherever the English have planted themselves, and spreading itself for evangelistic reasons in non-christian lands outside the British Empire.

And there seem to be three main obligations of vast extent imposed on this far-flung fellowship of churches by the very nature of their existence as Christian churches.

The first is to bring all their individual members to the fullest ripeness of age in Christ that is possible.

The second is to give primarily to the non-christian peoples whom God has joined with us in the British Empire, and also to those outside the Empire, the knowledge of the revelation of God in Jesus Christ.

And *the third*, the pressure of which is becoming increasingly felt, and yet has not been seriously felt by us (save for a very few) until within the last century, is to break out of the isolation which the Church of England never contemplated or desired, but which historical circumstances imposed upon it; and to take the part to which it seems to be called, in the reintegration of the Church of Christ throughout all the world.

I do not propose to speak to you to-night on the

first or the second of these objects, the pastoral and the missionary duties which we all acknowledge.

I should like to speak of the third, the duty of Anglicanism in regard to the Reunion of Christendom.

I remember hearing the Anglican Communion (or the Church of England, I forget which) spoken of at Lausanne last year, in terms then new to me, as the Bridge-Church. The words express the function which—in the view of a good many students in other churches—the Anglican Communion is pre-eminently, if not alone, fitted to discharge. Its place is one of balance between extremes. It had to organize its position in a day which had learnt to scrutinize and to test ; and yet, while this was its method, it maintained a determined preference for the old over the new, wherever the old could justify itself. And thus, it has affinities with churches both reformed and unreformed, which enable it if not to reconcile, at least to sympathize with, both camps.

Now if the Anglican Communion were ready to occupy the middle position to which many voices call her, the prospects of Reunion would be brighter than they are.

But at present, however true it may be that Anglicanism is marked out as the Bridge-Church, so far Anglicans have not proved themselves good bridge-builders. Anglicanism, if we may judge from its formularies, holds a definite and a consistent position ; but Anglicans speak with a divided voice, either going beyond their formularies, or stopping short of their full teaching. “ Who can speak for Anglican-

ism," we are asked, "and be accepted as representative by all other Anglicans?"

I do not say that there is widespread difference upon the deepest purely theological subjects, but so soon as we come to questions connected with the embodiment of the Christian religion in a visible Church (which is the crucial issue in the Reunion debate), acute differences manifest themselves. In a Communion which stands for the due proportion of the faith, the balanced attitude of the society as a whole is not adequately reflected in a correspondingly balanced attitude of its members.

Or, if it is really the case that there is a large and silent body of centrally-minded Churchmen, far outnumbering the more assertive spokesmen of either wing, it is essential that this centre should express itself, and make it be seen that it is in the Church's centre that the Church's genuine witness will be found.

One of the chief lessons which I learnt at Lausanne in 1927, is the need of study, if Reunion movements are to come to anything.

A good many years ago, an honoured teacher happily still with us, the Dean of Wells, wrote in connection with Reunion, "Study your differences."

But wise as his advice is, we see now that Anglicanism needs first of all to study its own identity. If Anglicans are to engage profitably in discussion with those who differ from us, we must know what Anglicanism is, and what we Anglicans stand for.

So long as we are concerned only with discussions amongst ourselves it is not so serious a matter that Anglicanism flows like a stream expatiating and

divagating over a broad river-bed. But even within ourselves, such a position is one of grave disadvantage. The recent Prayer-Book controversy was not merely concerned with the question, "How shall we express ourselves?" It revealed a deep division on the subject of "What do we wish to express?"

But it is when we stand face to face with other communions that the question "What do you stand for?" arises in its most critical form. "Do you Anglicans stand each for himself, or do you stand for Anglicanism? And if you stand for Anglicanism, what does Anglicanism mean for you?" Men ask, "Is Anglicanism ripe for engaging in Reunion movements? Will Anglicanism be ripe, until it is united? Those who seek Reunion without, should practise unity within."

When we are dealing with other churches, some of which possess very clear-cut theologies, and others of which (by the very nature of their witness) stand in undefined positions, it is of first-rate importance that Anglicans should be able to say, and say without contradiction from their own side, what Anglicanism means.

Let me illustrate the difficulty I refer to.

We are all familiar with the so-called Lambeth Quadrilateral put forward in 1888, as the irreducible minimum for Reunion-terms between Anglicanism and other churches.

But when the question is asked, "What do you mean when you present this Scheme of Four Articles as a basis of negotiation?" there is a very wide difference of opinion as to what is intended.

For my part, I am satisfied we shall not arrive at any solid result with this Formula, until we Anglicans get it clearly settled in our minds, whether the Quadrilateral is to be taken in its barest skeleton-form, or as an outline with an authoritative interpretation annexed to it.

For my part, again, I feel that we shall be ploughing the sands unless we decide on the latter course. It is not merely Forms that we are concerned with, but Forms which have a meaning, and which express something for us. Externals are the merest ritualism, unless they represent a meaning. Let me explain myself.

The Quadrilateral lays down the necessity of the Sacraments of Holy Baptism and Holy Communion. But, is it to make no difference to us what doctrine stands behind the use by others of these rites—whether it is the doctrine safeguarded in the Catechism and in the Baptismal and Communion offices or not? Does it make no difference whether, so long as the outward signs are used, they may mean something or nothing?

Similarly, in regard to the threefold Ministry. Is all that we are to ask simply this, “Will you accept three grades of ministers?” Is it all the same to us whether another Church accepts them purely out of deference to our super-sensitive conscience and as a concession to our weakness, or because it believes that Christ instituted a Ministry round which the Church grew up, and that our Ordinal provides for the transmission of this historic Ministry in an authoritative way?

These questions, I repeat, are of most serious

importance; for the entire future of a compact depends upon whether the two contracting parties mean by their formula the same thing. If they may mean by it what they like, provided they say the same words or do the same acts, there is no deep spiritual *rapprochement* at all. On the other hand, if they mean the same thing, the temporary adjustment of slight external differences is a relatively simple matter. A real Reunion has come into being.

Now it is for reasons of this kind that Anglicanism needs to study its own identity. Anglicans should walk round their Zion, mark well her bulwarks and consider her towers. We need to be citizens at home in the whole of our city, instead of living only in half of it.

And that is why we need study; so as to learn that Anglicanism is a balanced system, not balanced in the sense that one half of its people may hold one half of its truth, and another half of its people the other half of its truth, but balanced in that its people generally see its truth steadily and see it whole.

We need to become more conscious of the corporate entity of which we are members, and in a sense trustees, and of the duty we owe to its authority over us.

Study is needed so that the knowledge of what Anglicanism really stood for in its classical period which found its ripened expression in the Prayer Book in use to-day, may become a general possession. We need to know what men meant by their separation from Rome, in days when the Church of England still retained its memories of its wider fellowship in

both directions, before it had crystallized into a separate organization content to live a separate life.

More study of the works of Anglicans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries is needed, and would contribute powerfully, I believe, to the integration of Anglican unity.

(a) It would bring the clergy of opposite schools closer together.

(b) It would help the laity to be more at one with their clergy in regard to Reunion than they are at present. For up to this, Reunion, as a matter of religious principle, has taken very little hold on the lay imagination.

(c) And it would help to make Anglicanism of to-day more truly homogeneous with the Anglicanism which gave us the Prayer Book, which is still the authoritative norm of the Anglican Communion.

The Anglican Communion is cast for a great part, but the lack of submission to its corporate authority on the part of its members frustrates at present its usefulness as the Bridge-Society.

In resisting the centralization of authority in the Pope Anglicanism did what it has never repented of: but when it rejected that exterior coercion, and omitted to replace it with any effective public court of reference at once spiritual and domestic, it went a long way towards destroying the principle of authority in the Church of England.

But a Society is more than the aggregate of its members: it is a moral entity possessed of the right to put some constraint upon them. And yet the Anglican Communion, which is such a moral entity,

standing as we have seen for a definite theological position, does not in practice exercise upon its members the constraint it has a right to claim.

There are two great needs at the present moment.

(i) The rediscovery by Anglicans generally of the balance of truth for which Anglicanism stands—an end only to be achieved by careful study. And (ii) the reassertion for Anglicans of the authority of their Society, an authority which shall lead them to subordinate their personal views and their right to think aloud to the more balanced judgment of the Church—an authority which will bring them into line with one another according as they consent to admit the claim upon them exercised by a common and acknowledged standard.

There is at present no final authority which can represent Anglicanism in a constitutional way. There is no parliament, and no synod embracing clergy and laity of all the autocephalous churches which are its members. There is no authority that can make decisions for the whole communion, or can pronounce constitutionally with the voice of the whole Society.

We speak of the authority of general consent; but consent must have a means of registering itself somehow and somewhere, if consent is to be ascertained.

I believe that nothing is so much needed for the health of the Anglican Communion at present, as the opportunity for its constituent churches to bring their respective contributions and experiences into the common stock, and, on the other hand, to check their individual ways of self-expression by comparison with the collective wisdom of the whole.

When we Anglicans know more of Anglicanism, and when we impose on ourselves as individuals a more loyal submission to its collective mind, we may look forward with reasonable confidence to being used in bringing about the wider unity.

FOURTEEN DAYS

A FINE WILL BE CHARGED FOR EACH DAY THE BOOK IS KEPT OVERTIME.

[illegible]

DEMCO 38-293

CINCINNATI BIBLE COLLEGE & SEM. LIBRARY
283.09 C561a
Church Congress/The Anglican Communion, main



3 4320 00009 6414

283.09

C561a

34898

Wilson, Canon H. A.

The Anglical Communion, Past,
Present and Future

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE
SEMINARY LIBRARY

A. No. 34898

D. D. No. 283.09

C561a

